A

SHORT DEFENCE

OF THE DOCTRINE OF

ATONEMENT for SIN

BY

The Death of Chriſt.

WITH

REMARKS upon ſome late Publications on that Subject.

I will alſo ſhew mine opinion. Job, xxxii. 10.
Speaking the truth in love. Epheſ. iv. 15.

LEEDS:

Printed for JOHN BINNS; and ſold by B. WHITE, Fleet-ſtreet; T. PAYNE, near the Mews-Gate; Meſſ. RICHARDSON and URQUHART, under the Royal Exchange; S. LEACROFT, Charing-Croſs, and E. JOHNSON, Ave-Maria-Lane, London; T. & J. MERRIL, at Cambridge, and D. PRINCE, at Oxford.

M.DCC.LXXIV.

[Price One Shilling and Six-Pence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE.

THE following obſervations were in part written before the public was informed, that the Rev. Dr. Prieſtley was the author of the *Appeal*, and ſome other tracts which are taken notice of in this eſſay.* My deſign being ſolely to examine ſentiments, without any reſpect to the perſons who eſpouſe them, I have choſen to continue the ſtyle I had begun to make uſe of, and to ſpeak of the author as yet unknown. I could not take the ſame method of avoiding the appearance of perſonal reflection in examining Mr. Graham's letters, becauſe his name was prefixed to them at their firſt publication: But the freedom uſed in my remarks upon them is deſigned to extend no farther than to the writings themſelves. I think it a ſhame for any, who profeſs themſelves candid inquirers after truth, to entertain the leaſt malevolence towards thoſe whoſe opinions

* See a Sermon preached on occaſion of his reſigning the charge of a congregation of Proteſtant Diſſenters in Leeds.

they are oppoſing, and I am ſure that ſuch conduct is contrary to the ſpirit of chriſtianity.

I have uſed the term *Socinian*, to diſtinguiſh thoſe who deny the doctrine of atonement, both as it prevents the neceſſity of tedious circumlocution, and as it is adopted by the writers whoſe works I am examining.†

I have informed the reader in the courſe of this work, in what ſenſe I uſe the principal terms belonging to this controverſy; and, as as far as I know, I have uſed them according to their moſt common acceptation. When I ſpeak of repentance or faith as being the *condition* of pardon, I mean no more by this mode of expreſſion than to aſſert, that the pardon of ſin, conſidered as the tranſgreſſion of the moral law, is never obtained without repentance and faith, and that it is always granted to the repenting and believing ſinner. When I call the death of Chriſt the *conſideration* of our forgiveneſs, it will be ſufficient for my argument if the term *conſideration* be conſtrued to imply no more than "ſomething neceſſary in order "to the pardon of ſin;" but I would not be underſtood to mean, that the death of Chriſt is not the condition of pardon in a higher ſenſe than our faith and repentance are. I have generally preferred the term *conſideration* to that of *condition*, in ſpeaking of the relation which the

† *Familiar Illuſtration*, p. 64. And Mr. Graham's Letters, p. 75. *Note.*

the death of Chriſt bears to our forgiveneſs, as more readily admitting and ſuggeſting the idea of worth or compenſation; but I have not ſtrictly adhered to this diſtinction.

I have ſtudied to avoid entering upon any queſtion which did not immediately affect the ſubject in debate, and to expreſs my arguments as conciſely as I could without being unintelligible. I do not mean to enter upon a full diſcuſſion of all that reſpects the doctrine of atonement; my deſign is only to prove that it is a doctrine of divine revelation. Much might be ſaid, and that of conſiderable importance, upon this ſubject, which I have wholly omitted; contenting myſelf with a brief, and yet, I hope, ſufficient anſwer to the principal objections made againſt the doctrine I have attempted to defend. What I have written is from a full perſuaſion of the truth and importance of this doctrine; but I ſhall be ready, I truſt, to correct any errors I may have fallen into, when they are pointed out to me.

I wiſh the reader every ſpiritual bleſſing that is offered to ſinners through Jeſus Chriſt, *who is made of God* to all that believe *wiſdom, and righteouſneſs, and ſanctification, and redemption.*

A SHORT DEFENCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

THE doctrines which relate to the character and offices of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, are undoubtedly of very great importance in the ſyſtem of chriſtianity; and their connection with our religious conduct is ſo intimate, that it is impoſſible we ſhould be right in the latter, if we err conſiderably with reſpect to the former. The acknowledgement of the divinity of Chriſt, for inſtance, calls for ſuch affections and behaviour towards him, as they who look upon him as a mere man cannot maintain. Our practical regard muſt likewiſe be much affected by our belief or diſbelief of the doctrine of atonement for ſin by his death. If this doctrine is without foundation in ſcripture, it muſt

muſt be a high affront to the Divine Majeſty, to place any hope of pardon on the cruel treatment, which a mere man like ourſelves met with in the world: But if our Lord Jeſus Chriſt made a ſacrifice for ſin by his death, and we are commanded to come unto God through ſuch a mediator; then their condition is dangerous indeed, who deſpiſe that ſacrifice, and reject that method of approaching God, which is appointed in the goſpel for guilty ſinners.

The doctrine of atonement has been treated with much contempt by ſome late writers, who have thought fit to ſpeak (as one of them expreſſes it) " with great indignation" againſt it; and to repreſent it, not only as contrary to the ſcriptures, but likewiſe as ſo abſurd in itſelf, that it would render the Bible indefenſible, if it contained ſuch a doctrine. I have examined, with ſome attention, the arguments on which this repreſentation is founded; and as they appear to me to be inconcluſive, I have ventured to point out wherein I think them faulty, and to give a ſhort defence of what I believe to be a fundamental doctrine of Chriſtianity.

The doctrine of the Socinians reſpecting atonement is this, " That God requires no " conſideration or condition of pardon, but " the repentance of the offender; and that, " conſequently, the death of Chriſt was no

" *real*

" *real* ſacrifice for ſin, but is called ſo in the " ſcriptures merely in a *figurative* ſenſe, by " way of alluſion to the Jewiſh ſin-offerings; " as our praiſes and other good works are " called ſacrifices, becauſe they are ſomething " *offered up* to God." On the contrary, the doctrine which I mean to defend is, ' That ' God has thought fit to require a conſidera- ' tion of pardon diſtinct from the repentance ' of the ſinner; and that this conſideration is ' the death of Chriſt, which was a real ſacri- ' fice for ſin, and ſtood related to the Jewiſh ' ſacrifices as the antitype to the type.'

I. It is evident, that the inſpired writers do ſpeak of the death of Chriſt as a ſacrifice for ſin. *Chriſt appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf.* Heb. ix. 26. *Chriſt hath given himſelf for us, an offering and a ſacrifice to God.* Eph. v. 2. *Chriſt was once offered to bear the ſins of many.* Heb. ix. 28. *He is the propitiation for our ſins.* 1 John, ii. 2. *After he had offered one ſacrifice for ſin, he for ever ſat down at the right hand of God.* Heb. x. 12. *By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified.* Ib. 14. &c. The queſtion then is, Whether this language, which abounds in the New Teſtament, is proper, and to be underſtood literally; or merely figurative, and uſed by way of alluſion to the Jewiſh ſacrifices.

It

It is an allowed rule of interpreting the ſcriptures, that every doctrine contained therein muſt be underſtood in its moſt plain and obvious ſenſe, conſidered in connection with its context, unleſs this ſenſe is clearly abſurd in itſelf, or contrary to other parts of ſcripture. Now it is ſelf-evidently right, that God ſhould appoint ſuch a way of extending mercy to penitent ſinners, as his infinite wiſdom ſaw the fitteſt to diſplay his hatred of ſin, and to maintain the honour of his righteous laws, and juſt government of the univerſe. And no good reaſon can be given, why God, as governor of the world, might not appoint a ſacrifice to be the means of forgiveneſs for tranſgreſſions againſt his general laws, as he did for offences againſt thoſe particular laws, which he inſtituted as governor of one nation.

Let us then examine whether other parts of ſcripture require us to reſtrain the ſacrifical language, uſed concerning our Lord, to a merely figurative ſenſe, or whether we are led by them to underſtand it in its moſt proper and obvious ſignification.

The moſt ſtriking circumſtance of the Jewiſh oeconomy was, the appointment of ſacrifice as the means of obtaining pardon for offences committed againſt that conſtitution, which the Jews were under as a peculiar people. Sacrifice was undoubtedly a conſideration diſtinct from the moral character of the of-

fender

fender, yet was the ſtanding means of obtaining forgiveneſs, under the Moſaic diſpenſation, to thoſe who conformed to the conditions required by the ceremonial law.

Now if this diſpenſation was deſigned to repreſent that of the goſpel, then is pardon granted under the goſpel alſo, to thoſe who comply with the conditions required therein, by virtue of a conſideration diſtinct from the moral character of the offender, in the ſame manner as it was under the law of Moſes.

That the Jewiſh propitiatory ſacrifices were a neceſſary conſideration of forgiveneſs, and the means of obtaining it, appears both from their inſtitution, and the view which is given of them by the inſpired writer of the epiſtle to the Hebrews. The words of the inſtitution are plain to this purpoſe. *And it ſhall be when* any one *ſhall be guilty in one of theſe things, that he ſhall confeſs that he hath ſinned in that thing: And he ſhall bring his treſpaſs-offering unto the Lord for his ſin which he hath ſinned; and the prieſt ſhall make an atonement for him, for his ſin which he hath ſinned, and it ſhall be forgiven him.* Lev. v. 5, 6, 10. This paſſage compared with Lev. xvii. 11. which aſſures us that *it was the blood which made the atonement*, leaves no reaſon to doubt, that the ſacrifice offered by the offender was the appointed means of obtaining forgiveneſs of his offence.

The ſame view of propitiatory ſacrifices is given

given in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, when it is ſaid, *Almoſt all things are by the law purged with blood, and without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion*, chap. ix. 22. which proves that the ſacrifice was looked upon as the conſideration on which the pardon was granted. Now if it can be ſhewn, that theſe ſacrifices were intended to point out the nature of Chriſt's ſacrifice, or the relation which his death bears to the remiſſion of our ſins; then it will follow, that the death of Chriſt is the *conſideration* of our forgiveneſs, with reſpect to tranſgreſſions of the moral law, as the Jewiſh ſacrifices were the conſideration of their forgiveneſs, with reſpect to tranſgreſſions of the ceremonial and political law; and conſequently, that our Lord offered a real ſacrifice for ſin, *when he offered up himſelf*.

That the rites of the ceremonial law were intended to repreſent the manner of our redemption by Chriſt, is, I think, put beyond all doubt in the epiſtle to the Hebrews. For, not to mention here the many inſtances in which our redemption correſponds with thoſe legal rites, as enumerated in that epiſtle, from whence one might reaſonably infer a *deſigned* repreſentation; we are expreſsly told, that *the law had a ſhadow of good things to come*, chap. x. 1. Not a ſhadow *compared with* thoſe things, (which is undoubtedly true, though not the truth here intended) for that might

might have been ſaid of any thing unſubſtantial, though it had not the leaſt reſemblance of them, and is a very different expreſſion from that of the apoſtle: His words plainly intimate a reſemblance, for he adds, *and not the very image of the things*, which words convey no meaning unleſs we ſuppoſe him to be ſpeaking of a reſemblance.* The whole ſentence points out the imperfection of that ſimilitude, which the legal rites afforded of good things to come, by a metaphor taken from the art of painting; the former exhibited but the ſketch or outlines, and not a finiſhed portrait or complete picture of the latter.† The apoſtle uſes the term *ſhadow* in another place, in conjunction with a word which likewiſe fixes its meaning; *The prieſts that offer gifts according to the law ſerve unto the* EXAMPLE *and* SHADOW

* "By a *ſhadow*, I apprehend, is not meant, that the "whole *apparatus* of the Jewiſh tabernacle and temple, was "typical of the goſpel ſcheme. Throughout the epiſtle "to the Hebrews, the two ſchemes of Moſes and Chriſt "are compared, and the preference given, as in juſtice due, "to the latter.—But the apoſtle never once intimates that "the one diſpenſation was a type of the other. All he "ſays, is, that the religious ſyſtem of the Jewiſh legiſ-"lator, when compared with the nobler one of Chriſt, is "no more than a ſhadow compared with the ſubſtance." Mr. Graham's Sermon, intitled, *Repentance the only Condition of Final Acceptance*, p. 9.

† St. Paul uſes the ſame form of ſpeech in his epiſtle to the Coloſſians; wherein, ſpeaking of the ceremonial ordinances from which chriſtians are delivered, he ſays, *Which are a ſhadow* OF *things to come; but the body is of Chriſt.* Chap. ii. 17.

DOW *of heavenly things*, chap. viii. 4, 5. The ſame inſpired writer ſays, *Chriſt is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the* FIGURES *of the true*, chap. ix. 24. which expreſſes, with ſufficient clearneſs, the typical nature of the ceremonial law; and that no doubt might remain of the *intention* to prefigure by theſe rites, he informs us, that the firſt tabernacle was a *figure* FOR THE TIME THEN PRESENT, ver. 9. which could not have been ſaid of it, had it not been intended to prefigure things then future. But the evidence of this matter is not yet exhauſted; for we are farther aſſured, that this prefiguration was deſigned by God himſelf; for the apoſtle, ſpeaking of the high-prieſt entering into the holy of holies but once a year, adds the reaſon of it in theſe plain words, THE HOLY GHOST THIS SIGNIFYING, *that the way into the holieſt of all was not yet made manifeſt, while as the firſt tabernacle was yet ſtanding*, chap. ix. 8. And we are alſo informed, that Moſes was inſtructed concerning the typical nature of the ceremonial law by a divine admonition, *The prieſts that offer gifts according to the law— ſerve unto the example and ſhadow of heavenly things*, AS MOSES WAS ADMONISHED OF GOD WHEN HE WAS ABOUT TO MAKE THE TABERNACLE, chap. viii. 5. Thus the doctrine of atonement for ſin by the death of Chriſt is demonſtrated to be a doctrine of divine

vine revelation; for no terms can be found in language more clear and expreſs, than thoſe which are uſed to declare the typical nature of the ceremonial law.

II. I might here conclude the poſitive proof of the doctrine I am defending; but as the *prieſthood* and *ſacrifice* of Chriſt are largely treated of in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, and we have, therefore, a good opportunity of learning, whether the inſpired writer uſes theſe terms in the *proper* or *figurative* ſenſe; I ſhall take notice of ſome of the principal paſſages, which ſerve to fix their meaning.

The apoſtle defines, with great perſpicuity, the term *prieſt* in its proper ſenſe: A prieſt is one who *is ordained for men, in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and ſacrifices for ſin*, Heb. v. 1. But the deſcription which is given of our Lord's prieſthood agrees with this; *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-prieſt in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the ſins of the people*, chap. ii. 17. And, therefore, our Lord is a real and proper high-prieſt, becauſe he has the eſſential characters of one. To this office he was ſolemnly inſtituted by God; for as *no man taketh this honour unto himſelf but he that is called of God, as was Aaron: So alſo, Chriſt glorified not himſelf to be made an high-prieſt; but he that ſaid unto him—Thou art a*

prieſt

prieſt for ever after the order of Melchizedec, ver. 45.

The reality of Chriſt's prieſthood is likewiſe aſcertained by the declaration, that it was *after the order of Melchizedec*, who was, in the moſt proper ſenſe of the words, *prieſt of the Moſt High God*; for if our Lord's prieſthood was after his order, it was alſo real, and not figurative.

The apoſtle, ſpeaking of the imperfection of the Levitical prieſthood, and of its giving way to the prieſthood of Chriſt, ſays, *The prieſthood being changed, there is made*, OF NECESSITY, *a change alſo of the law*, chap. vii. 12. Now this argument requires, that Chriſt be a true high-prieſt, otherwiſe there was no need that the law ſhould be changed; for there were figurative prieſts under the law, as well as at any other period, that is, perſons who offered the *ſpiritual ſacrifices* of prayer and thankſgiving unto God; nay, the whole Jewiſh nation is called, in this ſenſe, a *kingdom of prieſts*, Ex. xix. 6. and, therefore, the apoſtle could never have argued a change of the law from Chriſt's prieſthood, had it not been a real one.

Our Lord is repreſented as being a more excellent prieſt than thoſe of the order of Aaron, in that he was ordained to the office with an oath; *Thoſe prieſts were made without an oath; but this with an oath, by him that ſaid unto him, The Lord ſware and will not repent, Thou*

Thou art a prieſt for ever after the order of Melchizedec, chap. vii. 12. But if Chriſt is only called a prieſt becauſe he devoted his life to the ſervice of God, and died in defence of his doctrine; to talk of his ſuperior dignity in being conſtituted a prieſt with an oath, is to make a mere jingle of ſounds without a meaning.

The ſuperior dignity of our Lord as a prieſt is likewiſe argued from other particulars, which prove his prieſthood to be real, and not metaphorical: As that he excelled the high-prieſts under the law in having no occaſion to offer up a ſacrifice for his own ſins, but only for thoſe of the people. *Such an high-prieſt became us,—who needeth not daily, as thoſe high-prieſts, to offer up ſacrifices, firſt for his own ſins, and then for the people's, for this he did once when he offered up himſelf. For the law maketh men high-prieſts which have infirmity; but the word of the oath which was ſince the law, maketh the Son, who is conſecrated for evermore*, chap. vii. 27, 28.* Now if Chriſt did not properly offer any ſacrifice for the ſins of the people, what can the inſpired writer mean by informing us, that he excelled the Jewiſh high-prieſts in not offering one for himſelf? The argument is important, and concluſive, if we conſider the death of Chriſt as a *real* ſacrifice for ſin; on any other ſuppoſition, the reaſoning is childiſh.

* See alſo chap. v. 1, 2, 3.

The *ſacrifice*, which this great *high-prieſt of our profeſſion* offered up for us, was *himſelf*. This ſacrifice, the apoſtle informs us, exceeded in its expiatory virtue thoſe which were offered under the law, and therefore we are aſſured that it was a proper one. If the death of Chriſt has no influence in procuring the remiſſion of our ſins, but as it leads us to repent of them; then it has no expiatory virtue at all, but only a tendency to promote that which properly expiates our guilt. But the apoſtle's reaſoning does by no means agree with this ſentiment: He ſays, *If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the aſhes of an heifer ſprinkling the unclean, ſanctifieth to the purifying of the fleſh*: How MUCH MORE *ſhall the blood of Chriſt, who, through the eternal ſpirit, offered himſelf without ſpot to God, purge your conſcience from dead works to ſerve the living God*, chap. ix. 13, 14. It is not good ſenſe to talk of the greater comparative efficacy of a ſacrifice, which, as a ſacrifice, has no efficacy at all: Nor could it with any propriety be ſaid, that if the blood of bulls was ſufficient to purify the fleſh, then the blood of Chriſt was *much more* ſufficient to purge the conſcience, unleſs the efficacy of the latter were of the ſame kind as that of the former.

When the apoſtle would point out the dangerous condition of thoſe, who reject the Lord Jeſus as their Saviour, or, in his own emphatical

tical language, *who tread under foot the Son of God*; he does it by reminding us, that there is no other ſacrifice for ſin than that which our Lord made by his death. *If we ſin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſin*, chap. x. 26. Now if Chriſt made no ſacrifice for ſin by his death, it is a ſtrange kind of reaſoning, to tell us there is no other: And if the term be applied to the death of Chriſt only by way of metaphor, then the aſſertion is falſe; for there have been many beſides our Lord, who have offered their lives in the cauſe of truth, and for the good of mankind, which is all that the figurative uſe of the term implies.

When the inſpired writers inform us, that ſome of the circumſtances of our Lord's death happened through an *intention* to conform to particular Jewiſh inſtitutions, they thereby aſſure us, that they did not compare the death of Chriſt to thoſe inſtitutions merely by way of alluſion, in order to reconcile mankind to the notion of a ſuffering Saviour. For then the conformity would have been imaginary or accidental, which is inconſiſtent with an intentional one. But, on the other hand, an intentional conformity was neceſſary on this ſuppoſition (and on this only), that thoſe inſtitutions were deſigned to be typical, and, therefore, an aſſurance of ſuch a conformity ſtrongly intimates that they were ſo. *The bodies of thoſe*

beaſts, whoſe blood is brought into the ſanctuary by the high-prieſt for ſin, are burnt without the camp. WHEREFORE *Jeſus alſo, that he might ſanctify the people with his own blood, ſuffered without the gate*, Heb. xiii. 11, 12. See likewiſe John xix. 36.

III. Before I proceed to anſwer the particular objections made to the doctrine of atonement, I will conſider it in another point of view, from whence we may likewiſe diſcern that it is founded on divine revelation.

If Chriſt died only to confirm his doctrine, and to give us an example of patient ſubmiſſion to the will of God; then there is nothing different in the nature or deſign of his death, from that of any other teacher of chriſtianity, who ſuffered in defence of what he taught; Paul, and Peter, and all the martyred chriſtian teachers, died *for* us juſt in the ſame ſenſe as Chriſt died for us: * But this is inconſiſtent with the ſcriptural account of Chriſt's death.

St. Paul, reproving the Corinthians for their contentious behaviour in oppoſing the principal teachers of chriſtianity to one another, and to Chriſt, endeavours to rectify their conduct by informing them, that they were to look upon

* "The circumſtantial account of the ſufferings and "death of Chriſt, in the 53d chapter of Iſaiah, might have "been the deſcription of any other good man in the ſame "ſituation, with this only difference, that the moral ef-"fects of it are repreſented to be more extenſive." *Theological Repoſitory*, vol. I. p. 129.

upon all the miniſters of the goſpel as ſtanding in the ſame relation to them. *It hath been declared unto me*, ſays he, *that there are contentions among you—that every one of you ſaith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Chriſt*, 1 Cor. i. 11, 12. *Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but miniſters by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?* chap. iii. 5. Whereas he rejects with abhorrence the thought of their being conſidered as ſtanding in the ſame relation to them as Chriſt did. *Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?* The apoſtle could not mean in this paſſage to make a queſtion whether he himſelf had been put to death, or to aſſert, that if he died in defence of his doctrine it would not be for their benefit; for he ſpeaks elſewhere of being *offered up on the ſacrifice and ſervice of their faith*; but he evidently means to point out the difference of that relation in which Chriſt, and that in which their other ſpiritual teachers ſtood towards them; and gives this as a proof of ſuch difference, that *Chriſt died* FOR *them*. Now if Chriſt had only died *for* them in the ſame ſenſe that Stephen and others had already done, and that he himſelf ſhortly was to do, to ſay that Chriſt *died* FOR *them*, was giving no proof that he ſtood in a relation to them diſtinct from that of other teachers of the goſpel.

The apoſtle, in other paſſages, inſiſts upon the particular relation which Chriſt bears to us different from that of all other teachers of chriſtianity. As in 2 Cor. iv. 5. *We preach not ourſelves, but Chriſt Jeſus the Lord, and ourſelves your ſervants for Jeſus' ſake.* If Chriſt was but a mere teacher of God's will, it will be difficult to make ſuch declarations conſiſtent with truth; for in that caſe, the apoſtles preached themſelves as much as they preached Chriſt: And it will not be eaſy to find a good reaſon, why one preacher of the goſpel ſhould call himſelf the ſervant of thoſe to whom he preaches, for the ſake of another perſon, who was ſimply a teacher like himſelf.

The ſcriptures conſtantly repreſent the death of Chriſt as having a peculiar reſpect to our forgiveneſs and reconciliation with God, and this is expreſſed in a variety of phraſes. We are ſaid to be *juſtified by his blood,—reconciled to God by his death,*—to have *redemption through his blood, even the forgiveneſs of ſin,*—to be *perfected through his offering*, &c. Yet not one word is ſpoken concerning any ſuch relation which the death of the martyrs bears to us, although frequent and honourable mention is made of them. St. Stephen, and St. James had ſuffered death in defence of chriſtianity as well as our Lord, before the writings of the New Teſtament were finiſhed; and a very particular account is given of the behaviour and

and ſufferings of the former, who, according to the Socinian ſcheme, gave himſelf a ſacrifice for us preciſely in the ſame ſenſe as Chriſt did; yet we have not the leaſt intimation that any were *juſtified by the blood of Stephen*, or that he *bore our ſins in his own body*, and *made reconciliation for us:* Nothing like this appears in the whole New Teſtament; we are only commanded to be followers of their faith and patience. In the book of the Revelation by St. John, the whole body of chriſtian martyrs is repreſented as aſſembled together; many of theſe, without doubt, had been brought to repentance by the preaching and good example of others, and, therefore, according to the doctrine of Socinus, muſt have been juſtified by their blood; but nothing like this ſentiment appears; on the contrary, they are all ſaid to have *waſhed their robes, and made them white in the* BLOOD OF THE LAMB, and on that account to be before the throne of God, Rev. vii. 14, 15. They, and all the reſt who attain eternal felicity, aſcribe their ſalvation to the Lamb, the influence of whoſe death is declared to be of univerſal extent. *They ſung a new ſong, ſaying—Thou waſt ſlain, and haſt redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation,* chap. v. 9.

Again; If the death and reſurrection of Chriſt are only to be conſidered as motives to

our

our repentance, they could never have been declared in holy writ to be *neceſſary* for the remiſſion of ſins: For if the remiſſion of our ſins flows merely from the mercy of God, without reſpect to any other conſideration than our repentance; then nothing elſe is *neceſſary* to our forgiveneſs.* Yet St. Paul ſays, *If Chriſt be not raiſed* (and, conſequently, if he has not died) *ye are yet in your ſins*, 1 Cor. xv. 17. Now the apoſtle could not have argued thus, if nothing but repentance was neceſſary to their forgiveneſs. He might, indeed, have ſaid, as he does in the preceding verſes, *If Chriſt be not riſen,—we are found falſe witneſſes of God, becauſe we have teſtified of God, that he raiſed up Chriſt:* but he could not add, that the remiſſion of their ſins was affected by the failure of this conſideration, if no ſuch conſideration was neceſſary to that remiſſion. On the contrary, if Chriſt be conſidered as our high-prieſt, appointed to offer a ſacrifice for ſins, and to riſe again that he might enter the holieſt with his own blood, there *to appear in the preſence of God for us*; then there is ſome pro-

* "It is only neceſſary," (in order to underſtand how we are juſtified *through the redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus*,) "to ſuppoſe that our redemption or deliverance "from the power of ſin, *i. e.* our repentance and refor-"mation, without which there is no promiſe of pardon, "is *promoted* by the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt." *Triumph of Truth*, p. 21.

propriety in the aſſertion, that if Chriſt be not raiſed we are yet in our ſins; becauſe the want of his reſurrection would prove that he had failed in the execution of his office, and, conſequently, that his ſacrifice was inſufficient to make atonement for tranſgreſſions.

Laſtly; If forgiveneſs is granted to penitent ſinners without any reſpect to the death of Chriſt, we ought to have no reſpect to it in aſking forgiveneſs at the hands of God. But if we are commanded to come to God through the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and our views are directed to his mediation while we implore the divine favour, then is pardon granted with a reſpect to his mediation.*

We are commanded to pray *in the name of Chriſt*, which ſurely intimates, that we ought to have a regard to him in our addreſſes to God. *Whatſoever ye ſhall aſk in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son*, John xiv. 13. It is allowed that this is one of the peculiarities of chriſtianity; but to pray with the temper of Chriſt, as ſome interpret the expreſſion, is no *peculiarity* of chriſtianity, for even natural religion teaches us, that we ſhould worſhip God with reverence, love, and ſubmiſſion, which is all, I ſuppoſe,

* "When David and other penitents confeſs their ſins, "and intreat for pardon, they refer themſelves to the "divine mercy *only*, without ſeeming to have the leaſt "idea of any thing farther." *Triumph of Truth*, p. 21.

ſuppoſe, that is meant by the *mind of Chriſt*. If any one ſhould imagine, it is praying in the name of Chriſt, to ſay *through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord* at the end of our prayers, without meaning any thing by thoſe words, with ſuch an one, I apprehend, it would be needleſs to argue.

The peculiar regard which is due to Chriſt in our approaches to God, is clearly intimated in the firſt epiſtle to Timothy. The apoſtle, after exhorting that *ſupplications, prayers, interceſſions, and giving of thanks be made for all men*, adds, *For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Chriſt Jeſus*, chap. ii. 5. Now if by a *mediator* is only meant one who declares the mind of God to mankind, then there are as many mediators as there are inſpired teachers of religion.§ But the manner in which the apoſtle expreſſes himſelf ſhews, that Chriſt is our mediator in a ſenſe peculiar to himſelf, and the context leads us to underſtand the term in its moſt common acceptation, as expreſſive of one who treats with God on our behalf, as well as with us on the behalf of God. It

§ " A mediator, in the ſenſe of ſacred ſcripture, is *one* " *between God and the people*; who declares to them the " mind of God, denounces judgments upon the diſobe- " dient, and proclaims pardon to penitent characters; and " there being only two authentic revelations from heaven " to our world, of courſe, we read only of *two mediators*, " employed to communicate the ſame to the people; and " if there was to be a third revelation, there would alſo " be occaſion for a third mediator," &c. See Mr. Graham's ſermon, before quoted, p. 8.

It may be objected, that Moſes is called a *mediator*, Gal. iii. 19. and, therefore, that it cannot be proved from the application of this title to Chriſt, that he ſtands in any relation to us different from that in which Moſes ſtood to the people of Iſrael. In anſwer to this I would obſerve, that Chriſt is not merely called *a mediator* in this paſſage, but the ONE *mediator between God and men*; a form of ſpeech very different from that made uſe of with reſpect to Moſes. Moſes is likewiſe called *a god*, but ſurely the apoſtle's ſolemn declaration that there is but ONE *God* would ſhew, that the title is applied to him in an inferior ſenſe, though the unity of God were taught in no other part of the Bible. And ſince our Lord is ſtyled the ONE *mediator* in ſuch a connection, we may with equal propriety conclude, that he is our mediator in a ſenſe which can be attributed to no other perſon.

The author of the epiſtle to the Hebrews expreſsly founds our boldneſs in addreſſing the throne of grace upon the preſence of our compaſſionate high-prieſt in heaven; which proves that reſpect is due to him in thoſe addreſſes. *Seeing then that we have a great high-prieſt, that is paſſed into the heavens, Jeſus the Son of God—let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy*, chap. iv. 14, 16. And again in chap. x. 19—22. *Having therefore, brethren, boldneſs to enter into*

into the holieſt by the blood of Jeſus, by a new and living way which he hath conſecrated for us through the vail, that is to ſay, his fleſh; and having an high-prieſt over the houſe of God: let us draw near with a true heart, in full aſſurance of faith, &c.

St. John encourages the true chriſtian to hope for pardon from the conſideration that he has a powerful advocate with the Father, who is the propitiation for his ſins. *My little children, theſe things write I unto you, that ye ſin not: And if any man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our ſins,* 1 John, ii. 1, 2. The apoſtle, in this paſſage, is evidently attempting to remove the diſcouragements with which ſincere chriſtians may be afflicted, under a ſenſe of the manifold defects of their obedience; and the argument he propoſes for this purpoſe is expreſſed in terms ſo plain, that no ſubtilty of criticiſm, one would think, could ever ſet aſide the obvious ſenſe of it: The different parts of this paſſage fix the meaning of the principal terms in ſuch a manner, that to alter them from their moſt obvious ſignification, is to render the whole ſentence obſcure or unintelligible. For ſhould it be ſaid, that the word here rendered *advocate* ſometimes ſignifies *a comforter*, the expreſſion *with the Father* ſhews that it cannot mean ſo in this place. Our Lord promiſed that he would

would ſend the Holy Ghoſt to reſide as a comforter *with all his true diſciples*, but to tell ſuch that if they ſin they have *a comforter with the Father*, is, in my apprehenſion, to talk unintelligibly. But the following verſe clearly determines the ſenſe of the paſſage; for this aſſures us, that Chriſt is our *advocate with the Father*, as being the *propitiation for our ſins*, and therefore he is here very emphatically ſtyled *Jeſus Chriſt* THE RIGHTEOUS.* Such are the inſtructions given to penitent believers in the goſpel, and in them we may diſcern both the truth and importance of the doctrine of atonement for ſin by the death of Chriſt. Were the Socinian hypotheſis true, ſuch directions could have no place in the inſpired writings, ſince they are ſubverſive of what that ſyſtem accounts the true goſpel of Chriſt.

IV. Let

* Mr. Graham ſays, in his Letters, p. 45, that "the "Greek word ιλασμος," (propitiation) "is never uſed by "the ſacred writers in the ſenſe of *rendering God propi-* "*tious.*" The word εξιλασκομαι is perpetually uſed in the Septuagint for *making atonement*, in conformity to which ſenſe of the word, the phraſe ιλασμος περι των αμαρτιων ημων, which is twice applied to our Lord in St. John's firſt epiſtle, cannot be more juſtly tranſlated than by *the propitiation*, or *propitiatory ſacrifice for our ſins*. In the epiſtle to the Hebrews alſo, Chriſt is ſaid to have become our High-prieſt, εις το ιλασκεσθαι τας αμαρτιας τε λαε, *to expiate* or *make reconciliation for the ſins of the people*, chap. ii. 17. So that whatever is meant by *making atonement*, thus much is evident, that Chriſt is *that* with reſpect to the remiſſion of our tranſgreſſions of the moral law, which the Jewiſh propitiatory ſacrifices were with reſpect to the tranſgreſſions of the ceremonial law.

IV. Let us now take a view of the principal objections made to the doctrine of atonement, and conſider whether they are ſufficient to overturn the arguments propoſed in defence of it.

1. The author of the *Appeal* aſſerts,* that it is impoſſible to reconcile this doctrine with thoſe ſcriptures, which ſpeak of our being juſtified *freely* by the grace of God, and that "the declarations of divine mercy to the penitent are all abſolute, without the moſt "diſtant hint of their having any reference to "any conſideration on which they are made, "as Pſalm lxxxvi. 5. Dan. ix. 3." †

It is granted, there are in the ſcriptures many declarations of mercy, which do not mention an atonement as the conſideration on which pardon is granted; there are likewiſe many, which neither mention an atonement nor

* P. 18.

The arguments which our author has urged againſt the doctrine of Atonement in his *Appeal*, *Triumph of Truth*, and *Familiar Illuſtration*, he has treated rather more diffuſely in his *Eſſay on the proper end of the death of Chriſt*, contained in the firſt volume of the *Theological Repoſitory*. But as the three former tracts are our author's lateſt publications on the ſubject, if I miſtake not, and as in them his ſentiments are expreſſed with more conciſeneſs than in the Theological Repoſitory; I have only referred to the latter with reſpect to thoſe arguments which are not contained in the former. Indeed, I did not know that all the above-mentioned treatiſes were compoſed by the ſame author, until I had written a conſiderable part of this defence.

† *Triumph of Truth*, p. 20.

nor repentance itſelf; but it will not follow from hence, that either the one or the other is unneceſſary. If we deſire to know the whole counſel of God reſpecting us, we muſt take into conſideration the whole of divine revelation; and I ſubmit it to the candid reader to determine from the ſcriptures already quoted, whether there are not ſome declarations of divine mercy to the penitent, which contain more than a diſtant hint of a conſideration of pardon diſtinct from our own penitence. If pardon is granted to all who come unto God through Jeſus Chriſt in the way he has appointed, that pardon is certainly as *free* with reſpect to us, as if there were no mediator between God and man; and the Antinomian, who aſſerts there is no condition of pardon required of us, is as much ſupported in his opinion by the declarations of *free-grace*, as the Socinian, who aſſerts there was no condition performed by our Mediator. The inſpired writers of the New Teſtament ſaw no more contradiction between the freeneſs of God's grace, and the propitiation made by the death of Chriſt, than the reſt of the Jews did between the goodneſs of God in remitting their offences againſt the ceremonial law, and the efficacy of thoſe ſacrifices, which were the appointed conſideration of that remiſſion; or than the Socinians do between free-grace, and the neceſſity of repentance as the condition of pardon.

pardon. That remarkable paſſage in Rom. iii. is ſo full to this purpoſe, that if there were no other in the Bible, it is ſufficient to determine this matter. *For all have ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God; being juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt: whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteouſneſs for the remiſſion of ſins that are paſt, through the forbearance of God: to declare, I ſay, at this time his righteouſneſs; that he might be juſt, and the juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus*, ver. 23—26. The apoſtle, in this paſſage, treats expreſſly on the method of our juſtification before God, which he affirms to be *through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt*; and he likewiſe points out the reaſon of this method, *that the righteouſneſs of God might be declared*, or demonſtrated; that he might appear to be juſt whilſt he juſtifies the believer in Jeſus. Here we have the whole doctrine of atonement conciſely delivered to us, and all attempts to take off the force of this ſcripture, as a proof of that doctrine, deſtroy the antitheſis which is evident in the paſſage, and, in my opinion, make the apoſtle's arguing to be flat and trifling. The *forbearance* of God in the remiſſion of ſins that are paſt is oppoſed to his *righteouſneſs*, which is ſaid to be *declared* by this method of forgiveneſs; and this oppoſition is a principal branch

of

of the apoſtle's argument, for he repeats, and lays a particular ſtreſs upon it, *to declare, I ſay, at this time his righteouſneſs, that he might be juſt, and the juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus.** Our author, and others, who by the *righteouſneſs* or *juſtice* of God mentioned here would have us underſtand his *goodneſs* or *mercy*, muſt give ſome good reaſon for ſuch an interpretation before it can be admitted; as

* The author of the *Illuſtration* tells us, that the word here rendered *propitiation*, ought to have been tranſlated *mercy-ſeat*; but he does not extend his criticiſm on the tranſlation to the whole of the paſſage. Though I think the tranſlation of this text ſufficiently accurate to ſhew, that the ſcope of the apoſtle's arguing is inconſiſtent with a denial of the doctrine of atonement; yet, in my opinion, the original ſets this in a much ſtronger light than the Engliſh tranſlation, which does not clearly expreſs the ſenſe of that very material ſentence in the paſſage, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων, which I ſhould imagine might with more propriety be rendered, *becauſe*, or *on account of the paſſing by of ſins committed aforetime*. The 25th and 26th verſes ought, I think, to be tranſlated in ſome ſuch way as this; *Whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiatory* (or *mercy-ſeat*) *through faith in his blood, for a demonſtration of his righteouſneſs, becauſe of the paſſing by of ſins committed aforetime, through the forbearance of God: For a demonſtration, I ſay, of his righteouſneſs at this period, that he might be juſt, &c.* The ſenſe of the apoſtle will then appear to be, That God, in ſetting forth Chriſt as our propitiatory or mercy-ſeat, by whom we have acceſs to God through faith in his blood, hath given at length the moſt clear demonſtration of his righteouſneſs or juſtice, which might appear to have been obſcured by his having hitherto, in his great long-ſuffering, paſſed by the ſins of men, without affording a ſufficient diſplay of his hatred to ſin, or ſuch a diſplay as is now made by the manifeſtation of our Redeemer. See a farther illuſtration of this paſſage, in a book intitled *Jeſus Chriſt the Mediator*, &c. p. 85.

the inſpired writer himſelf, in this very epiſtle, makes a diſtinction between the terms *righteous* and *good*. *Scarcely for a* RIGHTEOUS (or juſt) *man will one die; yet peradventure for a* GOOD *man ſome would even dare to die*, chap. v. 7. When the apoſtle, in the context to the paſſage above quoted, declares, that we are juſtified by faith, and not by the works of the law, I cannot ſuppoſe, as our author does,* that he only "intended to oppoſe the "doctrine of the Jews, who maintained "that the obſervance of the law of Moſes "was abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation;" becauſe it is added, *Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we eſtabliſh the law.* Which words can only be ſpoken of the moral law; for the apoſtle did not eſtabliſh the law of Moſes by preaching faith in Chriſt: On the contrary, he made it void, or declared it to be abrogated. Whereas, the moral law is eſtabliſhed by this doctrine; its juſtice being moſt clearly ſhewn by the propitiation made for our tranſgreſſions of it, and obedience moſt effectually ſecured by a true faith in Chriſt Jeſus.

2. "Can we wiſh for a more diſtinct, and "perfect repreſentation of the manner in "which God forgives the ſins of his offſpring "of mankind, than our Saviour has exhibited "to us in the parable of the *prodigal ſon*." *Appeal*, p. 19.

The

* *Illuſtration*, p. 54.

The deſign of this parable, as the context ſhews, was to reprove the Jews for their unreaſonable conduct, in objecting to our Lord's moſt gracious attention to notorious ſinners, and his kind reception of ſuch upon their repentance; and to teach us with what kindneſs we ought to behave to all repenting ſinners, when they return to the path of duty, however profligate their former conduct may have been. But whether the doctrine of atonement be true or falſe, cannot be determined from this parable, as the apparent deſign of it has nothing to do with this queſtion. The parable proves that God is merciful; and I ſhould ſuppoſe, that the appointment of a way, whereby ſinners may obtain forgiveneſs from his hands, does not infer that he is unmerciful. Expoſitors of ſcripture ſhould be very cautious of deducing any doctrine from a parabolic repreſentation, but what appears to be deſignedly inforced by that repreſentation: without this caution the moſt abſurd opinions may be, and, indeed, too often have been, urged from theſe parts of holy writ.

3. "To ſay that God the Father provided "an atonement for his own offended juſtice "is, in fact, to give up the doctrine. If a "perſon owe me a ſum of money, and I chuſe "to have the debt diſcharged, is it not the "ſame thing, whether I remit the debt at "once, or ſupply him with money wherewith "to pay me?" *Triumph of Truth*, p. 21.

This

This argument is founded upon theſe ſuppoſitions, that our ſins bear no other relation to God than that of debts to a creditor, and that to make atonement for ſin is the ſame kind of tranſaction as to pay a debt; but till theſe ſuppoſitions are either allowed or proved, no argument can be grounded upon them. As obedience is ſomething that we owe to God, our failures herein are ſometimes, with great propriety, called *debts* in the ſcriptures. But it is very evident, that the ſacred writings do not only repreſent God as our *creditor*, but likewiſe as our *moral governor:* And it muſt be acknowledged by every reaſonable perſon, that as he alone is acquainted with all the ends aimed at in the puniſhment of ſinners, he is the ſole judge of the propriety of it in any caſe, and of the conſiderations or conditions proper to be required in order to the remiſſion of our ſins.

4. " It can never be reconciled to equity, " or anſwer any good purpoſe whatever, to " make the innocent ſuffer the puniſhment of " the guilty." Ib.

Nothing can be plainer both from ſcripture and experience, than that many ſuffer for the ſins of others; and this is undoubtedly by the appointment of God, if he is the governor, and judge of all the earth: Whether the appointment be equitable or not, I leave our author to judge for himſelf; the fact he does not deny; " It is allowed," ſays he, " that we

" ſuffer

" ſuffer by the ſin of Adam, as any child may " ſuffer in conſequence of the wickedneſs of " his anceſtor."* And if theſe ſufferings are inflicted by God, acting the part of a judge, they are conſequently *penal*. Theſe conſiderations afford a ſufficient anſwer to any charge of injuſtice reſpecting the ſufferings of Chriſt: but, in truth, there is not the leaſt foundation for ſuch a charge in this caſe; for the doctrine of atonement ſuppoſes, that the undertaking of our Redeemer to ſuffer for our ſins was perfectly voluntary, and that he had full power over himſelf when he undertook the work of man's redemption.

5. " If it had been inconſiſtent with the " divine juſtice to pardon ſin upon repentance " only, without ſome farther ſatisfaction, we " might have expected to have found it *ex-* " *preſsly ſaid to be ſo* in the ſcriptures; but no " ſuch declaration can be produced either from " the Old or New Teſtament. All that can " be pretended is, that it may be *inferred* " from it." Ib.

Whatever doctrine may be fairly *inferred* from ſcripture, demands our aſſent and practical regard, as much as if it was therein *expreſsly declared*; nor have we the leaſt right to find fault with the manner in which any truth is made known to us, or to pay the leſs attention to it on that account.

* *Appeal*, p. 9.

When

When our Lord argued with the Saducees concerning the reſurrection, he choſe to make uſe of a paſſage in the Old Teſtament which proved this important truth only in a way of inference: And if he thought ſuch a method of reaſoning to be concluſive, we have ſufficient authority to think ſo too. The declarations of ſcripture reſpecting the doctrine of atonement are, in my opinion, neither few nor obſcure;* but of this the reader muſt judge when he has conſidered the paſſages quoted in defence of this doctrine, and others which I have taken no notice of, that are contained in the ſacred ſcriptures.

6. "Though good works are recommend-
"ed to us in the ſtrongeſt manner, it is never
"with any ſalvo or caution, as if they were
"not *of themſelves* acceptable to God." Ib.

If our good works are *of themſelves* acceptable to God, in the moſt ſtrict ſenſe of the word, without any reference to the mediation of Chriſt, what do the ſcriptures mean by telling us that they are *acceptable thro' Jeſus Chriſt. Ye are an holy prieſthood, to offer up ſpiritual ſacrifices*

ACCEPT-

* Mr. Graham differs widely from this opinion, for he ſays, "There is not a ſingle text in all the New Teſta-
"ment, as far as I can remember, that can, by any
"rules of juſt and ſober criticiſm be retained in ſupport
"of it," (the doctrine of atonement). "There are
"only two that ſeem to look that way, viz. Matt. xx.
"28. *He gave his life a ranſom for many*; and 1 Tim. ii. 6.
"*He gave himſelf a ranſom for all.*" Letters on the Atonement, p. 34.

ACCEPTABLE TO GOD THRO' JESUS CHRIST, 1 Pet. ii. 5. BY HIM, *therefore, let us offer the ſacrifice of praiſe to God continually*, Heb. xiii. 15. The phraſes *by Chriſt*, and *acceptable thro' Chriſt*, cannot mean, that our good works or *ſpiritual ſacrifices*, are to be done in the temper or after the conduct of Chriſt, for that is included in the very notion of their being good. We can offer no *ſpiritual* ſacrifice to God, *i. e.* no true homage or ſervice, but in the temper of Chriſt: For the *mind of Chriſt* means nothing more than an humble, thankful, holy mind; and the *conduct of Chriſt* is only another expreſſion for a righteous conduct: So that according to the Socinian doctrine, all that can be meant by a command to offer our ſpiritual ſacrifices *through Chriſt* is, that when we are thankful to God we muſt be thankful to him, and when we praiſe him we muſt give him praiſe.

To what I have before ſaid on this ſubject of acceſs to God through Jeſus Chriſt, I would here add, that *holy* perſons are repreſented in ſcripture as ſtanding in need of the blood of Chriſt to cleanſe them from ſin. *If we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in darkneſs, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowſhip one with another, and the blood of Jeſus Chriſt his ſon cleanſeth us from all ſin.* 1 John, i. 6, 7. By *walking in the light* is undoubtedly meant, living in the true know-

ledge

ledge and fear of God; and to ſuch the aſſurance is given, that the blood of Chriſt cleanſeth them from all ſin. Now if the blood of Chriſt bears no other relation to the forgiveneſs of ſin, than that of any martyr who dies in defence of the truth,* with what propriety can ſuch a declaration, as this text contains, be made to thoſe who are already in the favour of God? To make this reaſoning the more clear, let us ſuppoſe, that one who ſaw the martyr Stephen ſtoned to death, ſhould have been induced by his conduct to conſider the doctrine which he taught, and thereby to have been turned from a wicked courſe of life to the ſervice of God. With what propriety could it have been ſaid to ſuch an one, that if he walked in the light as God is in the light, the blood of Stephen ſhould cleanſe him from all ſin? Would ſuch language have conveyed any ideas to the chriſtian convert? Every one,

* "Chriſt being a man, who ſuffered and died in the "beſt of cauſes, there is nothing ſo very different in the "occaſion or manner of his death, from that of others "who ſuffered and died after him in the cauſe of chriſtia-"nity, but that their ſufferings and deaths may be con-"ſidered in the ſame light with his." Theological Repoſitory, vol. I. p. 39.

The texts brought to prove this ſentiment are 2 Cor. i. 5. Col. i. 24. Phil. iii. 10. 1 Pet. iv. 13. Matt. xx. 23. When the ſufferings which the perſecuted diſciples of Chriſt undergo for righteouſneſs ſake are called the *ſufferings of Chriſt*, the expreſſion is undoubtedly figurative, and the reaſons for ſuch a figure are very obvious, without ſuppoſing, that the ſufferings of Chriſt bear the ſame relation to the forgiveneſs of ſin as thoſe of any perſecuted chriſtian.

I ſup-

I ſuppoſe, will allow, that ſuch an addreſs would have been downright nonſenſe. And ſince, upon the Socinian ſyſtem, the blood of Chriſt bears the ſame relation to our forgiveneſs as the blood of Stephen, we muſt make the ſame concluſion with regard to the apoſtle's language, or believe that Socinianiſm and Chriſtianity are, in this reſpect, oppoſite ſyſtems.

7. "If any of the Jews had had the leaſt "notion of the neceſſity of any atonement for "the ſins of mankind, they could not but "have expected a *ſuffering Meſſiah*; and yet "it is plain that the very beſt of them had "no ſuch idea." Ib. p. 22.

It is equally plain that the Jews *ought* to have expected a *ſuffering Meſſiah*, their own prophets having clearly foretold his ſufferings. *After threeſcore and two weeks ſhall Meſſiah be cut off, but not for himſelf.* Dan. ix. 26. *He was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, he was bruiſed for our iniquities; the chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him, and with his ſtripes we are healed,* &c. Iſaiah liii. Accordingly the Jews were often reproved for not expecting a ſuffering Meſſiah, and on this account charged with ignorance of the ſcriptures. Thus our Lord rebuked the two diſciples who were travelling to Emmaus; *O fools and ſlow of heart to believe all that the prophets have ſpoken:*

Ought

Ought not Chriſt to have ſuffered theſe things, and to enter into his glory? Luke xxiv. 25. And again, he ſaid to the whole body of diſciples, *Theſe are the words which I ſpake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things muſt be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moſes, and in the prophets, and in the pſalms concerning me.—Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer, and to riſe again from the dead the third day.* Ib. ver. 44, 46. St. Peter made the ſame declaration to the Jews in his preaching, after our Saviour's death; *Thoſe things which God before had ſhewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, he hath ſo fulfilled.* Acts iii. 18. And in the ſame manner St. Paul addreſſes them; *They that dwell at Jeruſalem, and their rulers, becauſe they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every ſabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.* Chap. xiii. 27. So that the arguments againſt any part of our Lord's mediatorial character, which are drawn from the ignorance of the Jews reſpecting it, are evidently invalid, becauſe it appears clearly that they did not know his real character.*

8. "Though

* I am quite at a loſs how to reconcile this argument againſt the doctrine of atonement with our author's own ſentiments; for he frequently ſpeaks of the antient predictions of our Lord's ſufferings and death, without giving

8. "Though our Saviour frequently ex-
"plains the reaſon of his coming, and the
"neceſſity of his ſuffering, it is never on any
"ſuch account," viz. that of making atone-
ment. Ib.

Our Lord appears to have paid ſome atten-
tion to the prejudices of the Jews, in the
things which he ſpake concerning himſelf;
and the chief ſubjects of his preaching ſeem
to have been thoſe, which would lead them
to receive him under his proper character,
when all things neceſſary to aſcertain that
character were accompliſhed. He taught the
truth to his moſt intimate and faithful diſci-
ples in a gradual manner, as they were able to
bear it; and profeſſed to them a little before
his death, that he ſtill left many things unſaid,
which he would afterwards teach them by his
Spirit; *I have yet many things to ſay unto you,
but ye cannot bear them now; howbeit, when he
the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you
into all truth.—He ſhall glorify me: for he
ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.*
John xvi. 12, 13. We ought, therefore, to
look for theſe things in the writings of the
apoſtles; and we may reaſonably conclude,
that the truths referred to by our Lord were
thoſe, which his ſufferings and reſurrection
would

ving the leaſt intimation that he thinks them either unin-
telligible or obſcure. See Theological Repoſitory, vol. 1.
p. 129. 341, &c.

would make more plain and intelligible. If then we find it declared in the apoſtolic writings, that one deſign of our Saviour's death was to make atonement for ſin, we have no reaſon to doubt of the truth of this declaration, though our Lord had not given the leaſt intimation of ſuch a deſign. But many intimations of this were given during his abode on earth, though it was not taught ſo explicitly before as after his ſufferings. At the firſt introduction of our Saviour into his miniſtry, his great herald pointed him out as one who ſhould make atonement for ſin; *Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the ſin of the world.* John i. 29.* This was a very uncouth ſimilitude, if Chriſt took away our ſin only by his doctrine and example; for lambs never took away ſin in this manner, nor in any other manner but that of expiatory ſacrifices; and St. Peter intimates, that the death of Chriſt bore this relation to our redemption; *Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as ſilver and gold, from your vain converſation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Chriſt,* AS OF A LAMB *without blemiſh and without ſpot.* 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.‖

Our

* The author of the *Appeal* claſſes this text amongſt thoſe in which Chriſt is repreſented as a *ſacrifice.* Theological Repoſitory, vol. 1. p. 125.

‖ Should any one object, that the redemption here ſpoken of is from the *power* of ſin, which was not the proper

Our Lord informed his diſciples, that he ſhould *give his fleſh for the life of the world.* John vi. 51. And added, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* Ver. 53. This expreſſion is undoubtedly figurative, but the figure is quite unnatural if Chriſt died merely as a teacher of divine truth; but if his death is to be conſidered as a ſacrifice, then the figure of feeding upon him is eaſy and familiar. Knowledge is often repreſented, in metaphorical language, as the food of the mind; but the expreſſion of feeding upon the teacher himſelf, merely as a teacher, was probably never heard of. St. Paul ſays, *I have fed you with milk, i. e.* the moſt plain doctrines of Chriſtianity, and *not with ſtrong meat, i. e.* the more obſcure; but he never talks of feeding chriſtians with his fleſh and blood; nor do we find any declarations of St. Peter's fleſh being *meat indeed,* and his blood *drink indeed.*

When our Lord, at the inſtitution of that ordinance which was deſigned to perpetuate the remembrance of his death, informed us, that his *blood was ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins,*

per effect of expiatory ſacrifices; it ſhould be remembered, that a true faith in Chriſt, by which we partake of the benefits of his ſacrifice, is always attended with holineſs of life, and therefore our deliverance from the *guilt* and *power* of ſin are always ſuppoſed to accompany one another, though one of them is often ſpecified alone when our ſalvation is ſpoken of in ſcripture.

and

and that *the new covenant was in or through his blood*, he ſurely gave an intimation, at leaſt, that his death bore the relation of a ſacrifice to us, and was the conſideration on which our pardon is granted according to the terms of the new covenant.

9. " When our Saviour deſcribes the pro-
" ceedings of the day of judgment, he doth
" not repreſent the righteous as referring
" themſelves to the ſufferings or merit of
" their judge for their juſtification; and the
" judge himſelf expreſsly grounds it on their
" good works only." Ib.

The concluſion which our author means to eſtabliſh by this argument is, that our juſtification is not grounded on the ſufferings or merit of our judge, but on our good works only. If this is his meaning, and I do not ſee what elſe he can mean, he has argued as much againſt his own doctrine, as againſt that he oppoſes; for he tells us in his *Appeal*, p. 18, " That no man who is a ſinner (and all men
" have ſinned) can be *juſtified by his works*.
" We all ſtand in need of, and muſt have re-
" courſe to *free-grace* and *mercy*." But our Saviour does not repreſent the righteous as referring themſelves at the day of judgment to the free grace and mercy of God for their juſtification, but expreſsly grounds it on their good works only; therefore, according to our author's way

way of arguing, men are not juſtified by free grace and mercy, but by their works only. The argument, which way ſoever it is turned, will appear to have no force, when we conſider, that the juſtification at the day of judgment is of a different kind from that about which we are now debating: It is neither grounded on the merits of our judge, nor on free grace, but on good works only, and is what ſome divines, with great propriety, call a *declarative* juſtification. We are juſtified *properly*, or *in the ſight of God*, as St. Paul aſſures us, whenever with a penitent heart we truly believe on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and this juſtification is through the blood of Chriſt. We are juſtified *declaratively*, or *in the ſight of men*, when we *ſhew forth our faith by our works*, as St. James ſpeaks. Abraham, for inſtance, was juſtified in St. Paul's ſenſe of the word, when he *believed God:* he was juſtified in St. James's ſenſe, when he *offered up Iſaac*. Compare Rom. iv. with James ii. Now as the deſign of the laſt public judgment is not that God may *diſcover* what men are, in order to regulate his diſtribution of rewards and puniſhments; but to *ſhew* what men are to themſelves, and an aſſembled univerſe, and to *reveal* his righteous judgment; on which account that awful period is called *the day of the* REVELATION *of the righteous judgment of God*. Rom. ii. 5; ſo the juſtification and condemnation

tion of men which are then to take place, will be ſolely founded on that which demonſtrates what they really were in their ſtate of probation, namely, their works, taking the word in its moſt extenſive ſenſe. *I ſaw the dead, ſmall and great, ſtand before God, and they were judged every man according to their works.* Rev. xx. 12, 13.

10. " Though St. Peter, in his diſcourſe " to the Jews on the day of Pentecoſt, ſpeaks " of their ſin in murdering Chriſt as of a hei- " nous nature, he ſays not a word of the ne- " ceſſity of any atonement,—but only exhorts " to repentance." And " All the diſcourſes " of St. Paul upon various occaſions, in the " book of Acts, are intirely moral." Ib.

If it were true, that the apoſtles did not teach the doctrine of atonement in any of thoſe few diſcourſes of their's which are recorded in the book of Acts, this would not afford a preſumption, much leſs a proof, that they did not teach it at all. It is evident, that they delivered different truths at different times, and we may ſafely ſuppoſe, that in this they adapted their diſcourſes to the ſtate of their hearers. If we are taught this, or any other doctrine in holy writ, it matters not in what part, or upon what occaſion. Let the Lord ſpeak, and it is our duty to believe, and obey.

But it is not true, that all the diſcourſes of the apoſtles recorded in the Acts are intirely

moral,

moral, if I underſtand our author's ſenſe of the word: For St. Paul, after having proved, in his ſermon at Antioch, that Jeſus was the Chriſt, and that the Jews had eventually fulfilled all that was written of him, concludes with this application, *Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveneſs of ſins: And* BY HIM *all that believe are juſtified from all things, from which ye could not be juſtified by the law of Moſes.* Acts xiii. 38, 39. The ſame apoſtle gives this ſolemn admonition to the elders of the church at Epheſus, *Take heed therefore unto yourſelves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers, to feed the church of God,* WHICH HE HATH PURCHASED WITH HIS OWN BLOOD. Chap. xx. 28. And St. Peter, in his diſcourſe before Cornelius, ſpeaking of Chriſt, ſays, *To him give all the prophets witneſs, that* THROUGH HIS NAME, *whoſoever believeth in him ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins.* Chap. x. 43.

11. "It is particularly remarkable, that "when ſacrifices under the law are expreſsly "ſaid not to be ſufficient for the pardon of "ſin, we are never referred to any *more avail-* "*ing ſacrifice*; but to good works only." Ib.

Let the reader judge of the propriety of this remark, when he has conſidered the following paſſage of ſcripture. *The law having a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image*

of the things, can never with thoſe ſacrifices, which they offer year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect: for then would they not have ceaſed to be offered; becauſe that the worſhippers once purged, ſhould have had no more conſcience of ſins. But in thoſe ſacrifices there is a remembrance again made of ſins every year. For it is not poſſible that the blood of bulls and of goats, ſhould take away ſin. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he ſaith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldeſt not, but a body haſt thou prepared me: In burnt-offerings and ſacrifices for ſin thou haſt had no pleaſure: Then ſaid I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. Above, when he ſaid, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offering for ſin thou wouldeſt not, neither hadſt pleaſure therein (which are offered by the law;) then ſaid he, Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the firſt that he may eſtabliſh the ſecond. By the which will we are ſanctified, through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all. And every prieſt ſtandeth daily miniſtering, and offering oftentimes the ſame ſacrifices, which can never take away ſins: But this man, after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſins, for ever ſat down on the right hand of God; from thenceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footſtool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified. Heb. x. 1—14. In this paſſage

paſſage we are informed, that the ſacrifices under the law were inſufficient to take away ſins (in the proper ſenſe of the word,) and for this, which the blood of bulls and goats could not do, we are referred to a *more availing ſacrifice*, the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt, which is ſufficient to perfect for ever them that are ſanctified. So that the reverſe of our author's objection is aſſerted in the plaineſt terms; and if ſuch authority of holy writ cannot decide the matter, we need not wonder, that it is found difficult to put an end to any controverſy by Scripture.

In the *Theological Repoſitory* ſeveral texts are produced to prove, that "whenever the legal "ſacrifices are declared, by the prophets, to "be inſufficient to procure the favour of God, "the only thing that is oppoſed to them, as "of more value in the ſight of God, is per-"ſonal holineſs, good works, or moral vir-"tue. See Pſal. li. 16, 17. Iſaiah i. 11—20. "Hoſ. vi. 6. Amos v. 22—27. Micah vi. "6, 7, 8."* Vol. I. p. 129.

* In this quotation from the prophet Micah, the 5th verſe is omitted, which, in my opinion, directs us to the true meaning of the paſſage. *O my People, remember now what Balak king of Moab conſulted, and what Balaam the ſon of Beor anſwered him from Shittim unto Gilgal, that ye may know the righteouſneſs of the Lord. Wherewith ſhall I come before the Lord, &c.* Balak was not rejected becauſe his ſacrifices were not ſufficiently rich or numerous, but becauſe he was defective in juſtice, mercy, and the love of God: And the Jews were put in mind of this, that they might not vainly hope to compenſate for their immoral conduct by the number of their expenſive offerings.

In order to underſtand theſe, and other texts to the ſame purpoſe, it is neceſſary to conſider the deſign of the legal ſacrifices, and the relation they bore to the Jewiſh people. Beſides being *a figure for the time then preſent* of the great ſacrifice, which was to be offered for the ſins of the world, they were appointed to remove the effect of thoſe various ceremonial uncleanneſſes, which prevented thoſe who were defiled by them from all acceſs to God in his public ordinances:* But they could not remove the guilt of any moral offence, conſidered as ſuch, or free the offender from being obnoxious to the final judgment of God. They *ſanctified to the purifying of the fleſh*, but *could not make him that did the ſervice perfect, as pertaining to the conſcience.* Heb. ix. 9, 13. They were inſtituted likewiſe as means of freeing the perſons who offered them, in the manner preſcribed, from the puniſhment of thoſe civil offences for which the divine lawgiver had not ordained certain death.† They were

* Theſe uncleanneſſes, however involuntary and void of moral turpitude, were breaches of the ceremonial law, and required an expiatory ſacrifice to make atonement, or remove the obligation to puniſhment from the offender. *If a ſoul touch any unclean thing,—and it be hidden from him; he alſo ſhall be unclean, and guilty.—And he ſhall bring his treſpaſs-offering*, &c. Lev. v. 2, 6. The moſt ordinary puniſhment in theſe caſes was excluſion from the public ordinances of God's worſhip. See Lev. xii, &c.

† God entered into a particular covenant with the people of Iſrael at Mount Sinai, and there gave them a body of

were undoubtedly always ſufficient for thoſe purpoſes for which they were inſtituted; and, therefore, when their inſufficiency is taken notice of, it is in ſuch caſes only as their efficacy was not deſigned to be extended to; either the removal of moral guilt, or deliverance from death in capital offences. When David was lamenting his adultery and murder, he ſays, *Thou deſireſt not ſacrifice, elſe would I give it thee; thou delighteſt not in burnt-offering: The ſacrifices of God are a broken ſpirit, &c.* Pſal. li. 16, 17. God did deſire ſacrifice in every caſe for which he had appointed it, as is plain even from the words immediately following

of laws for their government as a nation. This conſiſted of the moral law or ten commandments, together with a variety of ceremonial rites, and political injunctions. Temporal bleſſings and curſes were the ſanction by which this covenant was guarded. For ſome offences certain death was appointed; for others pardon was granted upon the offering of the appointed ſacrifice, for *without ſhedding of blood there was no remiſſion.* The efficacy of theſe ſacrifices extended no farther than to the averting of thoſe temporal evils, which the tranſgreſſors of the law of Moſes were expoſed to. The Jews, therefore, were under the moral law in two reſpects: 1ſt, As being God's general law, which extends to all mankind; and 2dly, As being part of that particular law which God inſtituted for that people, of whom he was, in a peculiar ſenſe, the king and law-giver. Hence a tranſgreſſion of the moral law by a Jew might be conſidered in a twofold view. It might be an unpardonable offence againſt the Sinai-covenant, and conſequently expoſe the offender to capital puniſhment; yet might be forgiven by God as his final judge upon his true repentance, and faith in the Meſſiah as then revealed. On the contrary, it might be a pardonable crime, and be actually forgiven through the offering of the appointed ſacrifice; and yet expoſe the ſinner, if impenitent, to the final judgment of God.

this

this quotation,* but this was not ſuch a caſe, and therefore the Pſalmiſt acknowledges its inſufficiency. It is true, he only mentions the ſacrifice of *a broken ſpirit, and a contrite heart* as acceptable to God in this inſtance; but if he underſtood his own writings as his inſpired commentator, the author of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, did, he had ſome reſpect to that *Prieſt after the order of Melchizedec* of whom he elſewhere ſpeaks.

Thoſe paſſages in the Old Teſtament which ſpeak with ſeeming contempt of ſacrifices, and other poſitive inſtitutions, were plainly intended to reprove the Jews for thinking to make up for their neglect of moral righteouſneſs by the abundance of their oblations, &c. For when poſitive inſtitutions are thus uſed by way of commutation for moral obedience, they become an abomination in the ſight of God:† Nay, whenever poſitive precepts really interfere with thoſe of a moral nature, the preference is always to be given to the latter, as

* *Do good in thy good pleaſure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jeruſalem: Then ſhalt thou be pleaſed with the ſacrifices of righteouſneſs; with burnt-offering, and whole burnt-offering: then ſhall they offer bullocks upon thine altar.* Ver. 18, 19.

† The account of Saul's behaviour in the affair of the Amalekites, 1 Sam. xv. and the reproof given him on that occaſion, ſet this matter in a very clear light. *Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and ſacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than ſacrifice; and to hearken than the fat of rams.* Ver. 22.

our

our Lord hath ſhewn in his diſcourſe concerning the ſabbath. Matt. xii. On the other hand, it is equally plain, that legal ſacrifices were as much inſiſted upon in their proper place as any duty of moral obligation, and the people were reproved by the prophets when they were defective in them. See Iſaiah xliii. 22—24. Malachi i. throughout, and chap. iii. 7—10.

12. "Many other things beſides the death "of Chriſt are expreſsly called *ſacrifices* by "the ſacred writers; and if it be univerſally "allowed that they are ſo called by way of "alluſion only, why may not the ſame be "the caſe with the death of Chriſt alſo." *Theological Repoſitory*, vol. I. p. 131. "Chriſt, "being called a *prieſt* can occaſion no diffi-"culty, when it is conſidered, that ordinary "chriſtians have frequently the ſame appella-"tion in the New Teſtament," &c. Ib. p. 132.

I have already ſhewn, that ſuch things are ſpoken of the prieſthood and ſacrifice of Chriſt, as are inconſiſtent with the metaphorical uſe of the terms, and that of conſequence they belong to our Lord in the proper ſenſe of the words. Where the terms in queſtion are uſed figuratively, we are obliged to put this conſtruction upon them, either becauſe the texts themſelves intimate their figurative meaning, or becauſe other paſſages of ſcripture require

quire it. When the whole Jewiſh nation is called a kingdom of prieſts, Exod. xix. 6. we are obliged to look upon this language as figurative, becauſe other ſcriptures aſſure us, that none could be real prieſts under the Moſaic diſpenſation but thoſe who were of the family of Levi. And the ſervices of Chriſtians are plainly diſtinguiſhed from real ſacrifices by being called SPIRITUAL *ſacrifices*, LIVING *ſacrifices*, *ſacrifices* OF PRAISE, &c. 1 Pet. ii. 5. Rom. xiii. 1. Heb. xiii. 15; but they are never called *ſacrifices* FOR SIN, by which, and other ſuch like epithets, the ſacrifice of Chriſt is diſtinguiſhed from thoſe things which have the term applied to them merely by way of alluſion.

13. "The death of Chriſt cannot be conſidered as a proper ſacrifice for ſin, becauſe many things eſſential to ſuch a ſacrifice were, in fact, wanting in it.—According to the Jewiſh ceremonial law (from which we muſt borrow all our notions of theſe things) it was primarily requiſite, in every ſin-offering, that it ſhould be provided, and preſented by the ſinner; Chriſt, therefore, could not die as a proper ſacrifice for a ſinful world, except the world had provided and preſented him to be ſacrificed, and alſo obſerved a variety of other forms, of which there is no trace in the hiſtory of the death of Chriſt." Ib. p. 133.

The

The ſum of this argument is, that nothing is a *ſacrifice* in the proper ſenſe of the word, which is not accompanied with all thoſe ceremonies, which were appointed for the Jews by the law of Moſes: But if ſuch are not *proper* ſacrifices, they muſt only be *figurative* ones, having that title applied to them in alluſion to real ſacrifices. Now I would beg leave to aſk our author, of what kind were the ſacrifices of the heathen world? They certainly were not accompanied with all the Jewiſh ceremonies; and yet I think he will ſcarcely ſay they were but figurative. He has himſelf aſſerted, that "ſacrifices" (in the proper ſenſe of the word) "were as familiar to the Gentiles "as to the Jews." Ib. p. 135. and if ſo, what becomes of this argument againſt the ſacrifice of Chriſt? The true notion of a *ſacrifice for ſin*, if I rightly underſtand it, is, that of 'ſomething devoted to death as the means of 'expiating guilt, or removing the obligation 'to puniſhment from the offender.' The efficacy of this depends intirely upon the appointment of God, and is a diſtinct conſideration.

14. "The death and crucifixion of Chriſt "was the grand objection to the religion "which the apoſtles preached. It was "ſtrongly urged both by Jews and Gen-"tiles. To the former it was a ſtumbling "block, and to the latter fooliſhneſs. It "cannot,

" cannot, therefore, appear ſurprizing, that " the apoſtles ſhould make uſe of all the means " in their power to leſſen the force of ſo for- " midable an objection. And what could " tend more to this purpoſe, than to take " every opportunity of ſpeaking of it in terms " borrowed from the Jewiſh ritual? The ſame " method was equally calculated to ſtrike the " Gentiles, to whom ſacrifices were as fami- " liar as the Jews." Ib. p. 135.

When we conſider the doctrine of the Socinians, that " Chriſt taught nothing but the " dictates of plain morality, and ſober good " ſenſe;"* that " there is nothing *new* in the " chriſtian ſyſtem beſides the motives to virtue " there exhibited;"† that " the New Teſtament " phraſeology, of Chriſt's *dying for our offences*, " *bearing our ſins*, and the like, imply nothing " more than barely ſuffering in the cauſe of " virtue and mankind;"‡ that " Chriſt fell a " victim to the licentiouſneſs of the nation he " belonged to, and the age he lived in;" and that " caſes of this kind are not uncommon in " the courſe of providence:"§ I ſay, when we conſider theſe things, and ſuppoſe that Chriſtianity contains nothing more than theſe ſentences imply; what is there in the death of Chriſt that ſhould make it a ſtumbling

* Theological Repoſitory, vol. I. p. 32.
† Mr. Graham's Letters p. 33.
‡ Ib. p. 56.
§ Ib. p. 59.

block

block to the Jews, or fooliſhneſs to the Gentiles? Surely there was no need that the apoſtles ſhould take every opportunity of referring to the Jewiſh ritual, to make this doctrine be embraced by the learned Greeks and Romans, to whom the idea of a man's dying in the cauſe of virtue and mankind was quite familiar. It appears highly improbable, (to ſay the leaſt) that ſuch a repreſentation of the death of Chriſt ſhould have been treated as fooliſhneſs and a myſterious affair by the civilized Gentile nations, when caſes of this kind were not uncommon in the world, and were greatly applauded by them. And this conſideration affords a ſtrong preſumption, that the apoſtles gave a different repreſentation of the death of Chriſt, with reſpect to the relation it bore to mankind. If the goſpel be only "the dictates "of plain morality and ſober ſenſe," with "the aſſurance that the reſpective effects of "virtue and vice ſhall take place beyond the "grave;" what propriety can there be in the apoſtle's repreſentation of it as ſomething *which the world knew not, a myſtery hidden from ages and generations, the wiſdom of God in a myſtery, which none of the princes of this world knew*, nay, *which the angels deſire to look into?* But that the WORD, who *in the beginning was with God, and was God*, ſhould take upon him our nature, and make himſelf a ſacrifice for us, that we might be reſtored to the divine favour, and partake of eternal felicity; this is ſuch a diſplay

diſplay of mercy and juſtice as deſerves all thoſe high expreſſions which the inſpired writers beſtow upon it.

15. " That the offering of an animal on " the altar was conſidered, in the law of " Moſes, in the ſame light as any other gift or " offering, and a ſacrifice for ſin, as any other " ſacrifice, is evident from ſeveral circum- " ſtances in their ritual, and ſeveral facts in " the Jewiſh hiſtory." *Theological Repoſitory*, p. 200. vol. I. The circumſtances and hiſtorical facts brought to prove this opinion, are theſe.

(1.) " In many caſes, when a perſon was " not able to provide an animal for ſacrifice, " an offering of flour was accepted." Ib.

This ſhews, that God prefers mercy to ſacrifice, and, therefore, in caſes of neceſſity, diſpenſes with the obſervance of his own poſitive inſtitutions; but does by no means prove, that ſacrifices for ſin were only conſidered as gifts or preſents. The neceſſity of the ſhedding of blood in the ordinary conſtitution of the law, is ſufficient to warrant the apoſtle's declaration, that *without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion*; eſpecially, as all defects in the particular ſacrifices, which were not preſumptuous, were remedied by the appointment of a general and annual atonement.

(2.) " The Philiſtines, convinced of their " fault in taking captive the ark of God, re-

" turn

" turn it with a preſent of golden mice and " emrods, to make atonement for them, evi- " dently in the place of ſacrifice." Ib.

Our author does not ſurely lay much ſtreſs on this argument. If the prieſts and diviners of the Philiſtines thought fit to ſend their mice and emrods as a treſpaſs-offering, on account of the particular plagues inflicted on them, it will not follow, that the ſacrifices for ſin inſtituted by God were conſidered in no other light than that of preſents.

(3.) " In the Jewiſh ritual the ceremonies " attending a ſacrifice for ſin did not differ in " any thing material from thoſe that were " uſed in any other ſacrifice," &c. p. 201. Hence our author concludes, that there was nothing vicarious in the ſin-offering, and that the uſe and ſignification of this and other ſacrifices were the ſame.

It is true, that in making the burnt-offering, and peace-offering, the offerer was commanded to lay his hand upon the head of the victim, as he did in making the ſin-offering; and the ſprinkling of blood was uſed in them all: But all this does not ſhew, that the ſacrifices in which blood was ſhed, " anſwer- " ed exactly to the uſe of *preſents* in civil life," nor invalidate the proofs I have given, that ſacrifices for ſin were the conſideration of forgiveneſs. The uſe of the ſigns mentioned indicates, I think, that the offerer was conſi-

dered

dered as a ſinner in all theſe offerings, rather than as one who was merely making a preſent to the Almighty. Our author is certainly miſtaken when he ſays, "it was not the "*ſacrifice*, but the *prieſt*, that was ſaid in the "Old Teſtament to *make atonement*:" Ib. For nothing can be more expreſs than the declaration, that the ſacrifice made atonement. *The life of the fleſh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your ſouls: for* IT IS THE BLOOD THAT MAKETH AN ATONEMENT *for the ſoul.* Lev. xvii. 11. Yet this does not contradict what is elſewhere ſaid of the prieſt making atonement; for ſince the blood only made atonement as ſhed by the prieſt according to the ritual, and the prieſt only made atonement by ſhedding the blood as directed, it comes to the ſame thing, whether the atonement be ſpoken of as made by the prieſt, or the ſacrifice; for both are included in either expreſſion.

(4.) "Whenever the writers of the Old "Teſtament treat largely concerning ſacri-"fices, it is evident, that the idea they had "of them was the very ſame with that which "they had concerning gifts, or preſents of "any other nature." Ib. p. 202.

For the proof of this we are referred to the 50th Pſalm. *Hear, O my people, and I will ſpeak; O Iſrael, and I will teſtify againſt thee: I am God, even thy God. I will not reprove*

thee

thee for thy ſacrifices, or thy burnt-offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy houſe, nor he-goats out of thy folds. For every beaſt of the foreſt is mine, and the cattle upon a thouſand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains; and the wild beaſts of the field are mine. If I were hungry I would not tell thee; for the world is mine, and the fulneſs thereof. Will I eat the fleſh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thankſgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Moſt High: And call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou ſhalt glorify me. Ver. 7—15. The reader muſt judge for himſelf, what ſort of proof this paſſage affords of our author's premiſſes. I confeſs I can ſee no evidence in this pſalm, that God inſtituted ſacrifices to be uſed as *preſents* are in civil life: On the contrary, the people are reproved, in my apprehenſion, for entertaining ſuch a notion of them, and for thinking to compenſate by them for their neglect of moral duties. I agree, therefore, intirely with our author in his remark ſubjoined to the quotation above given. "So far did the heathens give into this idea "of ſacrifices, as to imagine, that their gods "did really feaſt their noſtrils, at leaſt, with "the ſmell of them; and the reproof con-"tained in the paſſage quoted above, ſeems "to intimate the prevalence of ſome ſuch "groſs notion among the Jews."

(5.)

(5.) " Sacrifice was not univerſally neceſ-
" ſary for the purpoſe of making atonement;
" for, upon ſeveral occaſions, we read of
" atonement being made when there was no
" ſacrifice. Thus Phinehas is ſaid to have
" made atonement for the children of Iſrael
" by ſlaying the tranſgreſſors. Numb. xxv.
" 13. Moſes made atonement by prayer only,
" Exod. xxxii. 30. And Aaron made atone-
" ment with incenſe. Numb. xvi. 46, 47." Ib.

The paſſages here quoted ſhew us clearly what is the ſcriptural notion of *making atonement*, namely, 'the removal of the obligation to puniſhment from an offender,' or, which comes to the ſame thing, the doing of ſomething available for that purpoſe. What Phinehas did is thus deſcribed in the 11th verſe, *Phinehas hath turned away my wrath from the children of Iſrael, while he was zealous for my ſake among them:* This is repeated in other words in the 13th verſe, after the reward of his zeal had been mentioned, *becauſe he was zealous for his God, and made atonement for the children of Iſrael.* So that *making atonement*, and *turning away God's wrath*, are plainly ſynonymous expreſſions. When Moſes ſaid to the people of Iſrael, *Ye have ſinned a great ſin, and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I ſhall make an atonement for your ſin:* by *making atonement* he undoubtedly meant, averting the puniſhment due to their ſin. So when Aaron *ran into the midſt of the congregation with fire*

taken

taken from off the altar, and incenſe thereon, he made atonement for the people, that is, he did ſomething which averted the wrath of God, or ſtayed the plague begun among them. In theſe extraordinary caſes, extraordinary methods of making atonement were accepted; but this does not at all affect my argument, which is built upon the clear declarations of holy writ, that the ſtanding appointed method of making atonement under the ceremonial law was by ſacrifice, and that this was typical of God's method of forgiving offences againſt the moral law, made known more fully under the goſpel diſpenſation.

It may not be amiſs in this place, to direct the reader's attention to the manner in which this author oppoſes the doctrine of atonement. He firſt proves, as he apprehends, that the death of Chriſt is no proper or real ſacrifice for ſin, nor the antitype of the Jewiſh ſacrifices; but that it is called ſo merely in a figurative ſenſe, by way of alluſion to the Jewiſh ſacrifices, becauſe Chriſt *offered* himſelf to God for the good of mankind; that we make the ſame kind of ſacrifice as Chriſt did, when we *yield our bodies living ſacrifices* in God's ſervice, or offer him *the ſacrifice of praiſe*, or *lay down our lives for the brethren*; and, of conſequence, that the ſacrifices under the law, were tranſactions of a nature quite different either from our prayers, or Chriſt's death.

After he has ſettled this point, he then

proves, in like manner, that the legal ſacrifices for ſin had no relation to the remiſſion of offences, but " that the offering of an " animal on the altar was conſidered in the " ſame light as any other offering or gift." That " agreeable to the ſtanding and univerſal " cuſtom of the Eaſt, with reſpect to ſove- " reigns and great men, the Jews were never " to approach the divine preſence without " ſome offering," and that " their ſacrifices " exactly anſwered to the uſe of preſents in " civil life."

But how are theſe things conſiſtent with each other? If Chriſt is ſaid to have made himſelf a ſacrifice becauſe he *offered* himſelf to God, and real ſacrifices are no more than *offerings* or preſents, then the death of Chriſt had the nature of a real ſacrifice. Or if Chriſt did but make a figurative ſacrifice becauſe he merely made an offering of himſelf to God, then real ſacrifices muſt be more than mere offerings or preſents to the Divine Being. Theſe two repreſentations of the matter appear to me to be directly oppoſite, and, in that caſe, the arguments deduced from them (and our author's principal arguments, I think, are deduced from them) muſt deſtroy one another.

16. " Some texts of ſcripture ſeem to re- " preſent the pardon of ſin as diſpenſed in " conſideration of ſomething elſe than our " repentance or perſonal virtue; and accord- " ing to their literal ſenſe, the pardon of

" ſin

" ſin is, in ſome way or other, procured by " Chriſt. And had the literal repreſentation " been all of a piece, &c.—the account would " have had more of the air and conſiſtency, " at leaſt, of truth : but when the pardon of " ſin is ſometimes repreſented as diſpenſed " in conſideration of the *ſufferings*, ſometimes " of the *merit*, ſometimes of the *reſurrection*, " and even of the *life* and *obedience* of Chriſt; " &c. that the diſpenſing of pardon is ſome- " times ſaid to be the proper act of God the " Father ; and, again, that it is Chriſt who for- " gives us; we can hardly heſitate in concluding, " that theſe muſt be, ſeverally, *partial repreſen-* " *tations*, in the nature of figures and alluſions." &c. Ib. p. 252, 253.

Our author is as much concerned to anſwer this objection as they are againſt whom he brings it. He believes, I ſuppoſe, that the diſpenſing of pardon is the proper act of God the Father, yet if he heſitates to conclude that this is a *partial repreſentation* in the nature of a figure and alluſion, he gives up his argument; if he does not heſitate to make this concluſion, I ſhould be glad to know how pardon is really diſpenſed without figure and alluſion. If by the terms *partial repreſentation* and *figure* our author had only meant that kind of figure, where a part is put for the whole, I ſhould have had no objection to his aſſertion; but then his argument would have contained nothing againſt the reality of forgiveneſs being

diſpenſed on account of the mediatorial undertaking of Chriſt; his death, reſurrection, and interceſſion being parts of this, and coinciding with the idea of his making a real ſacrifice for ſin, as I have already ſhewn.

17. Many negative arguments, beſides thoſe I have taken notice of, are urged againſt the doctrine of atonement in the Theological Repoſitory, amongſt which are placed the promiſes of certain happineſs to the righteous, and the threatenings of miſery to the wicked; the prayers of holy men recorded in the Old Teſtament, in which they implore the mercy of God for the pardon of their ſins, and make profeſſion of their own ſincerity; and the like. I think it quite needleſs to give a particular anſwer to every argument of this kind, though our author thinks them to be of conſequence in this debate. "With me, I own," ſays he, "theſe negative arguments have great weight. "When I find a profound ſilence concerning "this ſuppoſed great doctrine of atonement, "upon occaſions on which I cannot help think-"ing it would have naturally occurred; when I "do not find that frequent mention of it, and "that ſtreſs laid upon it, which its impor-"tance would certainly require; when I find "no trace of it in any *direct meſſage* from God, "or in any *fact* recorded in the ſacred writ-"ings; I cannot help thinking that divines "muſt

" muſt have been miſtaken concerning its " ſuppoſed truth and importance." P. 266.

I readily allow, that the ſcriptures are ſilent with reſpect to this doctrine upon occaſions on which this author thinks it would have occurred, had it been true; and if he will inform me, why divine revelation was not given to mankind at firſt in its greateſt degree of clearneſs, without the ſlow ſucceſſion of diſpenſations, the laſt always improving on thoſe which preceded; and why men were left to wait four thouſand years before *life and immortality were brought to light*, though they had meſſage upon meſſage from God in that long interval; I will then acquaint him, why the doctrine of atonement was not clearly revealed on thoſe occaſions on which he thinks it ought to have been taught, if it were a doctrine of divine revelation.* I leave the reader to judge, when he has conſidered what I have urged in defence of this doctrine, whether or not there are " traces of it in *direct meſſages*

 " from

* I might here have anſwered our author in his own words, inſerting the term *atonement* inſtead of *a future ſtate*; for thus he argues concerning the latter. " To aſk why " this important doctrine of a future ſtate was not revealed, or not revealed with the ſame fulneſs of evidence " before the time of Chriſt, or why it is not known at " preſent to the whole world, is the ſame thing as to aſk, " why, in all the works of nature and providence, and in " all the diſpenſations of God to mankind, a ſimilar gradation is obſerved, and why nothing under the government of God is brought to perfection at once." *Theological Repoſitory*, vol. I. p. 36.

" from God, and in *facts* recorded in the " ſacred writings."

18. Our author has attempted to ſhew in his *Familiar Illuſtration*, that many of thoſe paſſages of ſcripture, which are uſually brought to prove the doctrine of atonement, will admit of a natural interpretation upon other principles. In his introduction to theſe criticiſms he ſays, that the death of Chriſt " being " compared to *ſo many things*, and things of " ſuch *different natures*," as a ſacrifice, a paſſover, a ranſom, &c. " proves that the re- " ſemblance in all of them is only in *certain* " *reſpects*, and that they differ conſiderably in " others.—Theſe," ſays he, " are all bold, " but ſignificant figures of ſpeech, the death " of Chriſt really correſponding to them all to " a certain degree; but they differ ſo widely " from one another, that no one thing can " correſpond to any of them throughout; for " then it muſt exclude all, or at leaſt moſt of " the reſt." *Illuſtration*, p 47.

There is no neceſſity to ſuppoſe, that each circumſtance of every inſtitution which was deſigned to typify the method of our redemption by Chriſt, ſhould have ſomething correſponding to it in the antitype; becauſe many, if not all of thoſe inſtitutions, had other purpoſes to anſwer, beſides that of being types of our redemption. The propitiatory ſacrifices, as I have already obſerved, were branches of a political

political law, and had an immediate reference to crimes committed againſt God as civil governor. Various circumſtances belonging to them might be needful in this reſpect, which were not intended to be typical. The ſame may be ſaid with regard to the paſſover, and other types of Chriſt. Beſides, ſo many things were to be prefigured concerning our Redeemer, that no one inſtitution could exhibit them all, and therefore it was neceſſary that different types ſhould be appointed. The whole ceremonial law did but afford an imperfect reſemblance of the things it typified; it was but *the ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things.*

19. It is aſſerted, that "ſacrifices for ſin "under the law of Moſes are never conſidered "as ſtanding in the place of the ſinner." Ib. p. 49.

The expreſſion "ſtanding in the place of the "ſinner," is ſomewhat ambiguous: it may mean either *ſuffering preciſely the ſame puniſhment to which the ſinner was obnoxious*, or *ſuffering what is ſufficient to free the ſinner from puniſhment*. It is in the latter ſenſe only that Chriſt is our ſubſtitute. He did not ſuffer preciſely the ſame puniſhment which we deſerve on account of our ſins, for that is *eternal death*, or the being given up to a ſtate of perfect ſin and miſery for ever; but he ſuffered what is ſufficient to free the offender from this

deſerved

deſerved puniſhment, in the way preſcribed in the word of God. And in this ſenſe, it is evident, the propitiatory ſacrifices under the law ſtood in the place of the ſinner; for the death of the animal, according to the ritual, freed him from that puniſhment, to which without it he would have been expoſed. He was not liable to puniſhment merely on account of neglecting to offer the ſacrifice which God had appointed; but he was conſidered as guilty previouſly to ſuch an offering. *If a ſoul ſin, and commit any of theſe things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord; though he wiſt it not, yet is he guilty, and ſhall bear his iniquity. And he ſhall bring a ram for a treſpaſs-offering*, &c. Lev. v. 17, 18. In theſe ſacrifices the *life* of the animal was given for the offender, and on this account the blood was appointed as the ſtanding means of making atonement. *The life of the fleſh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your ſouls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the ſoul,—for it is the life of all fleſh*, THE BLOOD OF IT IS FOR THE LIFE THEREOF. Chap. xvii. 11, 14. It is plain from this text, that it was not the penitent diſpoſition of the offender, but the ſacrifice which made atonement.

20. "Many perſons are carried away with "the ſound of the word *redemption*, as if it "neceſſarily implied that mankind, being in "a ſtate

" a ſtate of bondage, a price muſt be paid for " their freedom, and that the death of Chriſt " was that price. But the word which we " render *redemption* ſignifies only deliverance, " in general, in whatever manner it be ef- " fected." Ib.

It is true that nothing can be concluded from the word *redemption*, with reſpect to the manner in which we are redeemed. This muſt be inquired after in other parts of ſcripture; and from thence we learn, that we are delivered from the puniſhment of our ſins by the interpoſition of our Redeemer as a ſacrifice for ſin. *What the law could not do in that it was weak through the fleſh, God* hath done, *ſending his own ſon in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh, and for ſin* (or, according to the marginal reading, *by a ſacrifice for ſin) condemned ſin in the fleſh.* Rom. viii. 3. *He made him to be ſin* (or *a ſin-offering) for us, who knew no ſin; that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him.* 2 Cor. v. 21.

21. " Streſs has been laid upon the word " *for*, as if Chriſt dying *for* all, neceſſarily " implied that he died *in the ſtead* or *place* of " all." Ib. p. 50.

The mere uſe of the word *for* certainly proves nothing in this caſe; but when it is joined with other expreſſions which imply ſubſtitution, as *propitiatory ſacrifice*, &c. or when it is intimated to us that Chriſt died *for* us in ſuch

ſuch a ſenſe as can be applied to no other, (ſee 1 Cor. i. 13.) then we are neceſſarily led to lay ſuch ſtreſs upon the word *for*, as would otherwiſe be improper.

22. " Much ſtreſs has alſo been laid on " Chriſt being ſaid to *bear the ſins of mankind*; " as if they had been aſcribed or imputed to " him, and he had taken them upon himſelf, " and ſuffered the wrath of God for them. " *He ſhall bear their iniquities.* Iſa. liii, &c. " But the word does not ſignify to bear or " *take upon another*, but to *bear away*, or *re-* " *move*, by whatever means.—The phraſe " *bearing ſin* is never applied in the Old Teſ- " tament but to the *ſcape-goat*, which was " not ſacrificed, but turned looſe into the " wilderneſs, to ſignify the removal of the " ſins of the people, which God had forgiven. " —The evangeliſt Matthew had, moſt evi- " dently, this idea of the meaning of the paſ- " ſage in Iſaiah, when he applied it upon the " occaſion of Chriſt's healing the bodily diſ- " eaſes of men, viii. 17. For he ſays, that " he performed theſe cures, *that it might be* " *fulfilled which was ſpoken by the prophet* " *Iſaiah, Himſelf took our infirmities, and bare* " *our ſickneſſes.*" Ib. p. 50, 51.

Suppoſing the expreſſion *bearing ſin* to ſignify in the New Teſtament *bearing it away*, the ſenſe of the paſſages in which it is uſed will be the ſame; for how did Chriſt *bear away*

away the ſins of many, but by being offered up for them as a ſacrifice? *Now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf.* Heb. ix. 26. *Chriſt was once offered to bear the ſins of many; and unto them that look for him ſhall he appear the ſecond time, without ſin, unto ſalvation.* Ver. 28. The mention of his *appearing a ſecond time,* WITHOUT SIN, will, I think, moſt naturally lead to the rendering which our tranſlators have choſen; but however that be, the text plainly declares, that Chriſt *puts away our ſins by the ſacrifice of himſelf,* and that is all we contend for. The ſame ſentiment is conveyed by St. Peter, when he ſays, *Who his ownſelf bare our ſins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to ſin, ſhould live unto righteouſneſs: by whoſe ſtripes ye were healed.* 1 Pet. ii. 24. Here likewiſe the removal of our ſins is attributed to the ſacrifice which Chriſt made on the croſs; which was offered up, that we, being healed by his ſtripes, might ſerve him in righteouſneſs here, and partake of his eternal felicity hereafter.

I am ſurprized at the aſſertion, that "the phraſe *bearing ſin* is never applied in the Old Teſtament, but to the ſcape-goat," ſince that, and *bearing iniquity,* which means preciſely the ſame, are very common phraſes in the Old Teſtament, and generally ſignify *bearing the puniſhment of ſin,* or *making atonement for iniquity.*

*quity.** The goat that was ſlain, and the goat let looſe in the wilderneſs on the great day of atonement, were conſidered as *one* ſacrifice. *And Aaron ſhall take of the congregration of the children of Iſrael two kids of the goats for* A SIN-OFFERING, *and one ram for a burnt-offering*, &c. Lev. xvi. 5. Accordingly they are both ſpoken of as making atonement: They were both likewiſe made ceremonially accurſed, and equally defiled the perſons who touched them; for neither the man who led the *ſcape-goat* into the wilderneſs, nor he that carried out the fleſh of the *goat ſlain*, could return into the camp until he had *waſhed his clothes and bathed his fleſh in water*. From all which it is probable, that the two goats were intended to point out the ſame thing in different reſpects, the one by it's death, the *means* of pardon, the other by it's removal into the wilderneſs, the *certainty* of it.

Becauſe St. Matthew applies the prophet's prediction of Chriſt's *bearing our griefs and carrying our ſorrows* to his removing the bodily diſeaſes of men, it will not follow, that this was all the prophet meant, when he foretold

* As Lev. x. 17. *God hath given you the ſin-offering to* BEAR THE INIQUITY *of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord.* Chap. xxii. 9. *They ſhall keep mine ordinance, leſt they* BEAR SIN *for it, and die therefore, if they profane it.* Numb. ix. 13. *The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the paſſover; even the ſame ſoul ſhall be cut off from the people——that man ſhall* BEAR *his* SIN. *&c.*

that

that the Meſſiah ſhould be *wounded for our tranſgreſſions*, and *bruiſed for our iniquities*, that *by his ſtripes we might be healed*; that he ſhould *bear the ſin of many*, and that the Lord ſhould *lay on him the iniquity of us all.* I believe it is impoſſible for any one to think ſo while he reads the 53d chapter of Iſaiah: and it is evident, that our author himſelf thinks otherwiſe, becauſe he ſpeaks of this paſſage as a prediction of our Lord's own ſufferings. *Theological Repoſitory*, vol. I. p. 129. But the difficulty ariſing from the application of the prophet's words by the evangeliſt will vaniſh, when we conſider, that ſometimes in the New Teſtament a prophetic declaration is ſaid to be fulfilled in an event, to which it may with great propriety be applied, though it was not originally, or primarily at leaſt, ſpoken of that event. Such an application proves that the prediction was true in that ſenſe, but not that it is to be reſtrained to that ſenſe. We have two inſtances of this kind of application in the goſpel written by St. Matthew. See chap. ii. 15. compared with Hoſea xi. 1. And ver. 17, 18, of the ſame chap. compared with Jer. xxxi. 15. Some Socinian writers give a different turn to that clear deſcription of our Saviour's vicarious ſufferings in the 53d chap. of Iſaiah: They look upon this paſſage as containing only "a beautiful deſcription of ſuf-"fering innocence," and ſuppoſe the prophet meant

meant no more than to intimate that Chriſt "was ſo free from the ſuſpicion of guilt, "that his calamity muſt be charged to the of- "fence of others; and ſo extraordinary were "his ſufferings for their number and great- "neſs,—that whereas the reſt of the nation "had been very corrupt, it *ſeemed as if* God "had laid on him the iniquity of them all. "The phraſe of ſuffering for the ſins of men," ſay they, "as it neceſſarily implies innocence "in the ſufferer, ſo it does not neceſſarily im- "ply any thing farther."* This is a very eaſy method of putting an end to this, or any other controverſy. There needs no more than to paraphraſe the cleareſt declarations of holy writ as this author has paraphraſed thoſe of Iſaiah, which are almoſt as clear as any in the bible, and the matter is ſettled at once. It SEEMS, may any one ſay, AS IF *the wicked ſhould be turned into hell, and all the people that forget God*; Pſal. ix. 17. but this is only a beautiful way of frightening men to their duty. And, indeed, if the phraſe of *ſuffering for the ſins of men* neceſſarily implies no more than *innocence in the ſufferer*, I cannot ſee how the inſpired writers could by any expreſſions whatever convey the doctrine of atonement, even ſuppoſing it to be their deſign; for the ſame liberty of interpretation would ſet aſide any declaration of this kind, and render the moſt poſitive evidence of no effect.

* Mr. Graham's Letters on the Atonement, p. 60, 61.

23. "Chriſt

23. " Chriſt is ſaid to die a *curſe* for us, " becauſe the manner of his death was ſimilar " to that by which thoſe who were deemed " *curſed* under the law were put to death. " *Chriſt hath redeemed us from the curſe of the* " *law, being made a curſe for us; for it is* " *written, Curſed is every one that hangeth on* " *a tree.*" Illuſt. p. 51, 52.

In whatever ſenſe we underſtand the expreſſion *being made a curſe for us*, thus much is plain from the words of the text, that we, i. e. all true believers, are delivered from that penalty to which our breach of the law of God expoſes us, which is here called the *curſe of the law*, by the ſufferings of our Redeemer: and this proves the truth of the doctrine of atonement. It is not ſuppoſed, that Chriſt was " under the diſpleaſure of God," if by *diſpleaſure* is underſtood *diſlike* or *diſapprobation*; but that his ſufferings, being inflicted by God as a righteous judge, were truly *penal*, and deliver the penitent offender from the curſe of the moral law, as the propitiatory ſacrifices delivered the Jews from the curſe of the ceremonial.

24. " The death of Chriſt is called a " *paſſover*, becauſe it may be conſidered as a " ſign of our deliverance from the power of " ſin, as the paſſover among the Jews was a " ſign of their deliverance from the Egyptian " bondage." Ib. p. 47.

The

The paſſover, at its firſt inſtitution, afforded the Iſraelites an aſſurance, and a very ſignificant token, of their preſervation from the judgment of God, and of their deliverance from bondage: But what token did the death of Chriſt afford of our deliverance from the power of ſin, according to the account which the Socinians give of it? God permitted an innocent man to be cruelly put to death by a licentious people, therefore we ſhall be delivered from the power of ſin:—I think it requires uncommon penetration to diſcover here the agreement between the ſign, and the thing ſignified. Whereas, the death of Chriſt affords a moſt ſtriking token of our deliverance from ſin, if we conſider him as giving himſelf for us, that he might free us from the deſerved puniſhment of our ſins, and procure thoſe divine communications of the Holy Spirit, whereby we are delivered from the power of ſin, and enabled to ſerve God in righteouſneſs and true holineſs. If to the apoſtle's declaration in 1 Cor. v. 7. *Chriſt our paſſover is ſacrificed for us*, we add the conſideration of that ſpecial injunction given to the Jews, not to break a bone of the paſchal lamb, compared with the reaſon given for the preſervation of our Lord's bones, *Theſe things were done, that the ſcripture ſhould be fulfilled, a bone of him ſhall not be broken.* John xix. 36. we ſhall ſee reaſon to conclude, that the Jewiſh inſtitution had a typical

typical reſpect to the ſacrifice of our Redeemer: And it is probable, that this type was deſigned to exhibit the *benefits* included in our redemption by Chriſt, as the ſacrifices for ſin did the *means* of that redemption.

25. "Many divines, finding themſelves "obliged to give up the notion of Chriſt's "ſuffering *in our ſtead*,—alledge, however, "that God forgives the ſins of mankind *on ac-* "*count of the merit of Chriſt, and his interceſ-* "*ſion for us*; this opinion, like the former, is "favoured by the literal ſenſe of a few paſſages "of ſcripture; but is contrary to the general "and plain tenor of it, which repreſents all "acts of mercy as proceeding from the eſſen- "tial placability and goodneſs of God the Fa- "ther only." Ib. p. 52.

It is true, that in the Old Teſtament the mercy of God is generally mentioned alone when our forgiveneſs is ſpoken of, though many intimations are there given of the reſpect which our Lord's ſufferings have to this event. It muſt be acknowledged likewiſe, that the doctrine of atonement, and ſome other important truths, were not ſo clearly taught even by our Lord during his perſonal miniſtry, as they were after his aſcenſion by his inſpired meſſengers, agreeably to his own deſign and declaration: John xvi. 12, 13. But in the epiſtolary part of the New Teſtament, the neceſſity and efficacy of a mediator is conſtantly inculcated in all the variety of ex-

preſſion. We are ſaid to be *juſtified by the blood of Chriſt, accepted through the beloved,* to have *redemption through his blood even the forgiveneſs of ſin,* to be *juſtified in the name of the Lord Jeſus, reconciled to God by his death, &c.* In ſhort, our acceptance with God through the mediation of Chriſt is a truth inſcribed on almoſt every page of the apoſtles' epiſtolary addreſſes to the Chriſtian church. And here I would beg leave to remind the reader, that we have the cleareſt diſplay of Chriſtianity in the epiſtles of the New Teſtament, every thing neceſſary to complete the ſyſtem of divine revelation, being finiſhed when the inſpired penmen compoſed theſe parts of holy writ. All that our Lord thought fit to leave unſaid, had been revealed to the apoſtles by his ſpirit, as he had promiſed. His death, and reſurrection, with the ſubſequent events, had diſpelled all darkneſs from the minds of the diſciples. They now ſaw clearly the fulfilment of the Old Teſtament types and prophecies concerning the Meſſiah, and were no longer in doubt with regard to his character and offices. In the epiſtolary part of the New Teſtament, therefore, we have declared unto us *the whole counſel of God,* and herein it is aſſerted, with the greateſt preciſion, that our juſtification does not flow ſolely from the goodneſs of the Father, without any other medium than our repentance and reformation; but that mercy is extended to repenting and believing ſinners through the

Son,

Son, and that they only are intitled to ſalvation who *come unto God through him.**

Our author has an argument of another kind againſt that idea of Chriſt's interceſſion, which is included in the doctrine of atonement. "Beſides," ſays he, "there are many paſſages in "the Old Teſtament in which God is repre- "ſented as forgiving the Iſraelites, and receiv- "ing them into his favour on the account of "Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; and their poſ- "terity plead the merit of theſe their religious "anceſtors in their prayers."—"Admitting, "therefore, that God may grant favours to "mankind at the interceſſion of Chriſt, this "is not a privilege *peculiar* to Chriſt, but is "common to him and other good men who "went before him; ſo that the *general ſyſtem* "of the forgiveneſs of ſin can by no means "depend upon the merit and interceſſion of "Chriſt only." Ib. p. 53.

The paſſages of ſcripture quoted from the Old Teſtament on this occaſion,† and o-

 ther

* The author of the *illuſtration* appears to have a very different notion of this part of holy writ. He talks of the "Jewiſh diſguiſe," which the apoſtles, and eſpecially St. Paul have put upon the plain truth of God; and, after telling us what he eſteems the true goſpel, makes this remark, which ſome of my readers may probably think an extraordinary one. "However, the diſguiſe in which this "ſimple religion appears, as delivered to us through the "hands of the Apoſtles and primitive fathers, is not ſo "cloſe, but that, with proper attention, we are able to "look through it, and diſcern its true lineaments." *Theological Repoſitory*, Vol. 1, p. 428.

† Gen. xxvi. 24. *Fear not, I am with thee, and I will bleſs thee, and multiply thy ſeed for my ſervant Abraham's ſake.* Exod.

ther texts, plainly ſhew, that God has often granted favours to men for the ſake of their religious anceſtors and at the interceſſion of others; but they prove nothing farther. The doctrine of atonement implies, that no tranſgreſſion of the moral law, conſidered as ſuch, is forgiven, without a reſpect had to the mediation of Chriſt: And this differs greatly from any efficacy which can be ſhewn to belong to the prayers of righteous men. Our Saviour in the days of his fleſh interceded for others in a manner peculiar to himſelf. He addreſſed the Father in his own name, and in language by no means ſuitable to any other ſupplicant; *Father*, I WILL—John xvii. 24. Whereas he commands us to approach the throne of Grace in *his* name, and promiſes that he himſelf will anſwer our petitions. John xiv. 13, 14, &c. The interceſſion which Chriſt is now making in heaven for us, appears from the word of God to be of a different kind from that, which holy men are capable of making for others. It is of the nature of that interceſſion which the High-prieſt made on the day of atonement, when he entered the Holy of

Exod. xxxii. 13. *Remember Abraham, and Iſaac, and Iſrael, thy ſervants.* Deut. ix. 27. *Remember thy ſervants, Abraham, and Iſaac, and Jacob. Look not to the ſtubbornneſs of this people, nor to their ſin.* In all which texts there is a reference made to that covenant which God graciouſly eſtabliſhed with Abraham, that his ſeed ſhould be numerous, that they ſhould inherit the land of Cannan, &c. as the reader will find upon conſulting the chapters from whence theſe paſſages are taken.

of Holies with the blood of the ſacrifice; and, therefore, is mentioned in the ſcriptures with a particular reference to his death. *He bore the ſin of many, and made interceſſion for the tranſgreſſors.* Iſaiah liii. 12. *It is Chriſt that died, yea rather that is riſen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who alſo maketh interceſſion for us.* Rom. viii. 34. *He is able to ſave them to the uttermoſt who come unto God through him, ſeeing he ever liveth to make interceſſion for them*; being *ſuch an high-prieſt—who needeth not daily to offer up ſacrifice,—for this he did once when he offered up himſelf.* Heb. vii. 25, &c. *Chriſt is not entered into the holy places made with hands,—but into heaven itſelf, now to appear in the preſence of God for us.* Chap. ix. 24 This interceſſion of our Lord, being the conſequence of his giving himſelf a ſacrifice for the ſins of the world, and, as it were, the continuance of that tranſaction, is, therefore, of a peculiar nature, and has a peculiar influence on the remiſſion of ſins, which no interceſſion of any pious man on earth can have.

The interceſſion of the Spirit of God for us is likewiſe a diſtinct thing from the interceſſion of Chriſt. The Spirit maketh interceſſion for us by interceding *in* us, that is, by exciting in the minds of true Chriſtians unfeigned deſires after God, and every holy temper implied in the *fervent prayer of a righteous man. The Spirit alſo helpeth our infirmities; for we know*

not what to pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itſelf maketh interceſſion for us, WITH GROANINGS WHICH CANNOT BE UTTERED. Rom. viii. 26.

V. In the foregoing pages I have taken very little notice of Mr. Graham's Letters on the doctrine of Atonement, though they are the lateſt of the publications I have occaſion to examine, and are ſtrongly recommended by the author of the *Appeal.** The principal arguments which they contain are urged, and expreſſed with more candour, in the tracts I have been conſidering; and as my intention was to have nothing to do but with arguments, I choſe to make my reply to thoſe pieces which were the moſt candid and argumentative. Indeed, I find myſelf unwilling to take any notice of an author, who is perpetually miſrepreſenting the queſtion he debates, and who ſtrives to ſtrengthen his arguments by invective and abuſe of his opponents. However, it may not be amiſs to give ſome ſpecimens of this writer's manner of treating his ſubject.

1. He

" * I ſhall take the opportunity of this preface to recommend—that excellent ſermon of Mr. Graham's, intitled, " *Repentance the only condition of final acceptance*, and alſo " his *Letters on the doctrine of atonement*. In theſe pieces " the reader will find what I think to be a fair and undiſguiſed account of what is moſt eſſential in the religion of the goſpel, expreſſed with a plainneſs and energy " almoſt peculiar to the author." *Preface to a ſermon preached on occaſion of the Author's reſigning his paſtoral care of a congregation in Leeds.*

1. He obſerves, that " nothing tends more " to introduce confuſion into our ideas of re- " ligion than equivocal terms, and undefined " unſcriptural language." P. 5. Yet he ſeems not to have kept clear of this errror, which he juſtly eſteems to be very hurtful to religion. In his firſt letter he examines into the meaning of the word *ſatisfaction*. " Sometimes," he ſays, " it denotes the pleaſure which the " mind takes in any thing that is the object of " our hopes and purſuits; very often it means " the redreſſing of grievances, and repairing " damages and injuries done or received; and, " laſtly, it denotes the obedience due to the " commands of a ſuperior, properly made " known to us." P. 3, 4. This laſt he calls " the ſcripture notion of the term *ſatisfaction* " as applied to Chriſt," p. 6. and tells us, that " in the other ſenſe of it, as implying a " reparation of injuries, it is not to be found " in the New Teſtament, as applicable to " Chriſt." P. 5. This manner of ſpeaking of the term *ſatisfaction*, tends, I ſhould think, to make the reader ſuppoſe, that the writers of the New Teſtament apply it to Chriſt in the third of thoſe ſenſes which Mr. G. has here given. Whereas the word is not to be found in the New Teſtament, nor is it ever applied to the Meſſiah in the Old Teſtament, unleſs Iſaiah liii. 11. is to be excepted: *He ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul, and ſhall be ſatisfied.* Our author might, therefore, have

ſpared

ſpared himſelf the trouble of defining a term which the ſcripture does not make uſe of, eſpecially as he himſelf almoſt always uſes it in a ſenſe different from that which he calls the ſcripture notion of the term. I have wholly omitted the word *ſatisfaction* in my defence of the doctrine of atonement, for the reaſon I have juſt given; and, indeed, I ſhould be far from troubling myſelf about a doctrine that reſted on the meaning of a few equivocal expreſſions.

Puniſhment is another of thoſe terms, which Mr. Graham has taken pains to clear up; but he often uſes the word in a ſenſe that is inconſiſtent with his own definition of it. "Puniſhment," he ſays, "is ſuffering for "immoral behaviour," p. 23. "and, there-"fore, the *innocent* cannot be *puniſhed* in the "room of the guilty, without ſuppoſing him "capable of thoſe diſagreeable ſenſations "which attend the guilty, which is impoſſi-"ble." P. 29. Yet he frequently talks about the puniſhment of the innocent: As, "Can "a manifeſt act of injuſtice (for ſuch I con-"ſider the puniſhment of the innocent) ever "be the means of conciliating his favour "who loveth righteouſneſs?" P. 30. "Can "the honour of government be vindicated by "puniſhing the innocent in the room of the "guilty." P. 24. "Upon this ſcheme the "righteous are not even upon a level with the "wicked; for they are puniſhed, while the

"wicked

" wicked eſcape." Ib. " Better that many " guilty ſhould eſcape, than that one innocent " perſon ſhould be puniſhed." Ib. Here, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, Mr. G.'s common ſenſe gets the better of his critical knowledge, and conſtrains him to uſe the word *puniſhment* in its ordinary ſignification, that of ' ſuffering inflicted by judicial pro- ' ceeding.* If the ideas of *innocence* and *puniſhment* were incompatible, it would be as abſurd to talk of the injuſtice of puniſhing the innocent, as of the injuſtice of murdering the dead.

Atonement being the ſubject of Mr. G.'s letters, one might ſuppoſe he would be very clear in his definition of this; but he only informs us what it is not, and leaves us to find out its true meaning by ourſelves. " Atone- " ment," ſays he, " I will allow, was made by " the death of an animal, but you muſt not " therefore infer that it was ſlain in the room " of the offender. And though I may not be " able to aſſign the preciſe notion of atone- " ment, what it was, wherein it conſiſted, " and what was the end and deſign of it, I " think I am pretty ſure what it was *not*. It " did by no means expreſs a *ſubſtitution*," &c. P. 46. Yet this author uſes the term continually,

* In puniſhment the ſuffering is inflicted by *authority* either real or uſurped, and with *deſign*: the latter diſtinguiſhes it from *caſualty*, and the former from *violence* or *aſſault*. This authoritative deſign conſtitutes what is here termed judicial proceeding.

nually, as if it were a word perfectly understood by the reader.

2. When Mr. G. repreſents the ſentiments of thoſe who believe the doctrine of atonement, he gives no authorities for his repreſentations, nor does he quote a ſingle author who has written in defence of this doctrine. I ſhall not ſcruple, therefore, to charge him with *miſrepreſentation*, till he has quoted ſome author of credit as an authority for ſuch accounts of this doctrine as the following paſſages contain.* "The repreſentation given by Theologians "of the adminiſtration of the univerſe is, that "the omnipotent arm at the head of it was "actually lifted up, ready to ſtrike the blow, "and diſcharge the thunder-bolt on a ſinful "world, when Chriſt ſeaſonably interpoſed, "to wreſt it out of his hands." P. 14. "I "need not caution you againſt viewing the "beſt of beings in the light of a tyrant, deter-"mined to make ſinful men for ever miſera-"ble, had not Jeſus interpoſed." P. 15. "Had the advocates for this monſtrous ſcheme, "been attentive to the amiable light in which "nature, not to ſay revelation, exhibits the "deity,

* By *authors of credit* I mean ſuch as Biſhop Stillingfleet, amongſt thoſe of the Church of England, and Dr. Watts, amongſt the Diſſenters. Both theſe writers have taken pains to ſtate the doctrine of atonement, that it might be clearly ſeen what they undertook to vindicate; and from them Mr. Graham might have given a diſtinct account of what he oppoſes: But inſtead of this, he exhibits the reaſoning of ſome anonymous Antinomians, as the language of thoſe who believe this doctrine. See p. 31.

" deity, they never would have admitted the " idea of *implacability*. By ſaying he is *placable* " only in conſideration of a *ſatisfaction*, it is " plain they had no other idea; and yet this " is ſaying nothing, and worſe than nothing; " for it is ſtill holding him up in the light of " a capricious being, who is pleaſed with ex- " penſive offerings, and moved by foreign " conſiderations to do what he is not naturally " and eſſentially diſpoſed to do." P. 16. " I " ſee a manifeſt propriety in the ſufferings of " an innocent and good being to bring about " the nobleſt purpoſes of providence, but none " at all upon the ſcheme of ſatisfaction.—This " is, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, a *luſ-* " *cious doctrine*, which the mobility are exceed- " ingly fond of; and no wonder, indeed, they " ſhould, for it permits them to gratify their " ſenſual paſſions, at the ſame time that it " flatters their heavenly hopes." P. 30. " What elſe is Calviniſm," (and they who hold the doctrine of atonement are generally by this author denominated Calviniſts)* " but " a *commuting ſyſtem*, where conſiderations fo- " reign to moral character are made to ſupply " the want of it; where an external and vi- " carious

* " I know no medium between *Calviniſm*, properly ſo " called, and *Socinianiſm*. The latter is a ſcheme friendly " to virtue, and permits one to go quietly through the " world in the exerciſe of his reaſonable faculties. The " former is a religious *ſcare-crow*, that, like the Inquiſition, " in Popiſh countries, has long ſerved the purpoſe of ma- " king hypocrites and ſlaves in Proteſtant ones." P. 75. *Note.*

" carious righteouſneſs is ſubſtituted in the " room of a real and perſonal one." P. 72.

3. Mr. G.'s Letters abound with invective, and abuſe of thoſe whoſe ſentiments he oppoſes. " Whatever charms it" (the doctrine of atonement) " might have for the viſionary and li- " centious, no ſober or ſenſible man would " ever become its apologiſt." P. 52. " I " think the doctrine of Chriſt's atonement, as " believed by the bulk of profeſſed Chriſtians, " opens a wide gap for the introduction of " ſuch evils into ſociety, as would ſoon ſap " the foundation of it, were it not check'd by " better principles of nature's planting." — " But for this a Calviniſt would be a conſiſtent " being throughout, and form his practice " upon his principles: And in that caſe, I " think, we ſhould have as much occaſion for " gibbets as we have for churches." P. 64, 65. " The abettors of this doctrine, not much ac- " cuſtomed to argument, and knowing that " reaſon is not in their intereſt, generally in- " trench themſelves behind the authority of " *great numbers* and *great names*." P. 65. " Their general character is known to be that " of bigotry to their own modes and ſenti- " ments, without any grains of charitable al- " lowance for thoſe that differ from them." P. 69. Some readers may wonder why ſuch abuſe is ſo liberally beſtowed on this occaſion. Mr. G. tells us he has received perſonal af- fronts from ſome who hold the doctrine he op- poſes,

poſes, and perhaps the remembrance of them might ſomewhat influence his mind while he was writing. " Where will you find a Theologian," ſays he, " who will defend them" (the ſentiments he oppoſes) " by other argu- " ments than thoſe of *anathemas* and *execra-* " *tions?* I and others have lately had ſome " ſpecimens of the politeneſs and humanity " by which they are diſtinguiſhed in this reſ- " pect." P. 75. Yet we are not to ſuppoſe that our author means to ſpeak contemptuouſly in all this; for he himſelf has aſſured us to the contrary. " I would not," ſays he, " by " what I have ſaid, be underſtood to inſinuate " a contempt for popular prejudices, or that " they ought to be treated with contempt. " I would have them, on the other hand, " treated with all imaginable lenity." Ib.

4. There is an argument or two in Mr. G.'s letters, which I have not had occaſion to take notice of in examining the tracts before referred to: Theſe I ſhall now conſider.

(1.) Mr. G. aſſerts, that the doctrine of atonement is contrary to the principles of natural religion as they are deducible from the conduct of divine providence in the world. " The remedies provided in nature for thoſe " who hurt themſelves by their vices;" " the " affection which all animals are obſerved to " have for their offſpring," and " the diſpo- " ſition which we find in ourſelves to forgive " injuries," are in his opinion, " *proofs* that

" God

"God will pardon his offending offspring up-
"on their penitence." P. 8, 9, 10. The intelligent reader, I apprehend, will think theſe proofs not very concluſive; for the concluſion has certainly no neceſſary connection with its premiſſes. If our author would draw a real proof of his doctrine from the conſtitution of nature, he muſt make it appear, that repentance does in all caſes avert or remove thoſe natural puniſhments of ſin which God has appointed in the world. But it is evidently otherwiſe. 'The miſeries which, in the re-
'gular courſe of nature, are the conſequences
'of wickedneſs, are properly conſidered as the
'natural puniſhments of it. Some of them
'follow it with a ſwifter, others with a ſlower
'pace; ſome are tranſitory, others of longer
'continuance: but the penitence of a crimi-
'nal, even before their arrival, affords him no
'ſecurity againſt the ſloweſt of them; and
'when either his fears or his feelings have
'worked a reformation, ſuch as are naturally
'of longer continuance are not by that refor-
'mation preſently removed. Whatever then
'can be alleged, concerning the ends of pu-
'niſhment, or the ſatisfaction made by a re-
'formed penitent, when applied to this ſub-
'ject, muſt be trifling. All argumentation is
'here precluded. We have fact and expe-
'rience to convince us, that God does not al-
'ways pardon the repenting ſinner.'* Whatever

* Dr. Powell's Charge in 1772. See alſo Butler's Analogy, part 2d. chap. 5th.

ever notions we may gain by the light of nature concerning the divine mercy and juſtice, Revelation alone can ſatisfy us how far, and under what circumſtances, either the one or the other will be exerciſed towards ſinners. Mr. G. has ſufficiently confuted himſelf with reſpect to this argument againſt the doctrine of atonement: for although he adopts Dr. Duchal's opinion, that "it muſt have been an article of natural religion in all ages, and a fundamental article too, that God would forgive ſin to the truly penitent," and that "all wiſe men muſt neceſſarily have fallen into this ſentiment with much aſſurance;" § he nevertheleſs aſſerts, that "Mankind, before ſupernatural light aroſe upon them, were in a ſtate of great depravity and alienation from God, ſunk in ignorance, vice, and ſuperſtition;" and that "in ſuch a ſtate it is natural to ſuppoſe them very much at a loſs as to the terms of their acceptance with God." P. 52. But how are theſe things conſiſtent? If mankind in a ſtate of natural religion were very much at a loſs as to the terms of their acceptance with God, how is it that theſe terms are a fundamental article of natural religion, which every wiſe man would embrace with much aſſurance?*

(2.) It

§ See Dr. Duchal's letter to Dr. Taylor, ſubjoined to Mr. G.'s work, p. 81.

* The author of the *Appeal* ſeems to have fallen into the ſame inconſiſtency in his reaſoning upon this ſubject. For

(2.) It is ſaid, p. 43. " Had Chriſt offered " himſelf in the Jewiſh ſenſe of ſacrifice, that " is the literal and original ſenſe of it, he muſt " have incurred the guilt of offering to God a " human one, of all others the moſt offenſive " in his ſight."

Mr. G. offers nothing by way of proof of his aſſertion, that human ſacrifices are in all caſes offenſive to God. I ſuppoſe, therefore, that he imagines it to be an allowed truth which no one will diſpute. For my part, I am ſo far from thinking a human ſacrifice to be in all

For after having given extracts from ſeveral authors, by way of proof that mankind have always entertained juſt apprehenſions of the divine mercy, he makes this inference. " It is almoſt demonſtrable, that mankind have always " conſidered their maker and univerſal parent, in the ſame " light with that, in which reaſon and the ſcriptures, both " of the Old and New Teſtament, uniformly repreſent " him, viz. as of himſelf gracious and merciful, long-ſuf- " fering, forgiving iniquity, tranſgreſſion and ſin, not " willing that any ſhould periſh, but deſirous that all his " offending creatures ſhould repent and live." Yet when he comes to " ſubjoin, by way of concluſion, a conciſe " view of the ſcheme of ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt," he gives this deſcription of the ſtate of mankind without divine revelation. " Let us, then, ſuppoſe the whole race " of mankind to be in a ſtate of apoſtacy from God, loſt " to all ſenſe of religion and virtue, in the expreſſive lan- " guage of ſcripture, *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*; that with- " out a revelation and a ſaviour they were in the moſt " deplorably vicious and wretched circumſtances, in a " ſure way to make themſelves miſerable both here and " hereafter," &c. *Theological Repoſitory*, vol. I. p. 416, and 422. I cannot conceive how mankind could univerſally entertain ſuch ſentiments of God, as are contained in divine revelation, and yet be loſt to all ſenſe of religion, and be in a ſure way, without revelation, to make themſelves miſerable both here and hereafter.

all caſes an abomination to God, that I believe ſuch an offering to have been one of the higheſt acts of obedience that ever was performed by any mere man. *Take now thy ſon, thine only ſon Iſaac,* ſaid the Almighty to faithful Abraham, *and offer him for a burnt-offering.* This the holy man executed in intention, which was the ſame as to the virtuouſneſs or vitiouſneſs of the thing, as if he had actually done it :* Yet he received the higheſt applauſe from his unerring Judge. The doctrine of atonement ſuppoſes Chriſt to have laid down his life for ſinners in *obedience* to the will of his Father; the aſſertion, therefore, that this would have been a crime, or act of *diſobedience,* carries abſurdity on the face of it. If our author does not include this in his idea of Chriſt's ſacrifice, he is combating a ſhadow, and is engaged in a contention in which he has no opponent.

5. Mr. G. ſeems to me to have overturned his own arguments againſt the death of Chriſt being conſidered as a ſacrifice for ſin, in the ſame manner as the author of the *Appeal* has done. He aſſerts that " the death of Chriſt " is ſtiled a ſacrifice, not becauſe it was truly " and properly ſuch in the Jewiſh ſenſe of ſa- " crifices; but becauſe it was a diſtinguiſhed

* This ſeems to be the apoſtle's view of the matter, when he ſays, *By faith Abraham, when he was tried,* OFFERED UP *Iſaac; and he that had received the promiſes,* OFFERED UP *his only begotten ſon.* Heb. xi. 17.

" expreſſion of his regard to God. Hence " alſo other moral virtues, ſuch as *praiſe*, and " *thankſgiving*, *doing good*, and *communicating*, " are called by that name. In ſhort," ſays he, " as the New Teſtament ſacrifices are all ſpi- " ritual and moral ones, that of Chriſt muſt " be ſo too." P. 42. " Where he is exhi- " bited under Moſaic and Levitical images, " ſuch as *propitiation*, and the like, it is plain " that the writers uſe the figurative ſtyle." P. 43. " From all which," (ſpeaking of ſome preceding arguments, he ſays,) " it is evident, " that Chriſt being called our *propitiation* is " only in the alluſive way, and that he could " in no other ſenſe be an atonement, than " that of declaring God's gracious purpoſe of " *paſſing over* the ſins of men, on the condi- " tion of their future repentance. Not that " what he did and ſuffered *procured* that " mercy, but were only *declarative* of it." P. 48.

When Mr. G. tells us what was the nature of real propitiatory ſacrifices, he gives this deſcription of them. " Propitiatory ſacrifices I " conſider as *public certifications*, that the of- " ferers were either deſirous of being reſtored, " or actually were reſtored to the privileges " of citizens; not by virtue of the ſacrifice " which they offered, but of the penitent diſ- " poſition accompanying that ſacrifice." Ib. " So Chriſt," ſays he, " is our *propitiation*, " declaring us in a ſtate of favour with God; " not in virtue of what he ſuffered, but on

" con-

" condition only of our renewed obedience." Ib. Are not theſe two accounts of the matter manifeſtly inconſiſtent? If the proper idea of real propitiatory ſacrifices be that of *public certificates*, or *declarations* of God's favour to the penitent; and if Chriſt is our *propitiation* preciſely in the ſame ſenſe, as is here aſſerted; then it plainly follows, that he is not called ſo *figuratively*, but that his death was as *real* a ſacrifice as the Jewiſh propitiatory ſacrifices were.

6. The immoral tendency of the doctrine of atonement, and the practical advantages of Socinianiſm, are favourite topics with Mr. G.; he enlarges upon them frequently in his letters. I ſhall, therefore, make one remark on this head, before I conclude theſe reflections. Our author obſerves, that " the beſt and ſu-" reſt criterion of religious principles is their " moral influence; this is our Saviour's own " rule, *By their fruits ſhall ye know them*; the " fruits which they have a tendency and fit-" neſs to produce." P. 63, 64. " Now, " Sir," (adds he, addreſſing himſelf to his friend,) " I appeal to you, whether principles, " that in any degree relax the obligation of " the moral law, are principles which a wiſe " man would eſpouſe, or an honeſt man de-" fend?" Ib. Whether our author's doctrine has not ſome tendency to relax the obligation of the moral law, I leave the reader to judge, when he has conſidered the following ſentence reſpecting

reſpecting moral obligation. "To ſay that "every the leaſt error in moral life deſerves "eternal torments, is a hard ſaying, and who "can bear it." P. 19. How different is the language of ſcripture on this head! *The* WAGES *of ſin is* DEATH. Rom. vi. 23. *Death*, eternal death, as the context plainly intimates, and various other paſſages declare,* is the *wages*, the due deſert and reward of ſin, of ſin indefinitely, of every tranſgreſſion of the moral law.

May this awful truth be written upon our hearts, that we may apprehend rightly the *exceeding ſinfulneſs of ſin*, as the apoſtle ſpeaks, and be led by this knowledge to embrace the ſalvation which is by Jeſus Chriſt!

* As Gal. iii. 10. *Curſed is every one that continueth not in* ALL *things which are written in the book of the law to do them.* James ii. 10. *Whoſoever ſhall keep the whole law, and yet offend in* ONE *point, he is guilty of all.*

THE END.

4 AP 54

Printed for JOHN BINNS, Bookſeller in Leeds.

Lately publiſhed, the ſecond Edition, Price 3d. *of*

A SHORT DEFENCE of the DOCTRINE of the DIVINITY of CHRIST, with ſome Remarks upon a late *Appeal to the ſerious and candid Profeſſors of Chriſtianity.*

To which is added, A SUPPLEMENT, containing Obſervations upon a late *Familiar Illuſtration of certain Paſſages of Scripture.*